

**State of California
State Performance Plan
for**

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act of 2004

Due: December 2, 2005

Table of Content

Overview of California's State Performance Plan (SPP) Development	1
Indicator #1 - Graduation	3
Indicator #2 - Dropout	12
Indicator #3 - Statewide Assessments	21
Indicator #4 - Suspension and Expulsion	33
Indicator #5 - Least Restrictive Environment	41
Indicator #6 - Preschool Least Restrictive Environment	50
Indicator #7 - Preschool Assessment	55
Indicator #8 - Parent Involvement	66
Indicator #9 - Disproportionality Overall	71
Indicator #10 - Disproportionality Disability	74
Indicator #11 - Eligibility Evaluation	77
Indicator #12 - Part C to Part B Transition	80
Indicator #13 - Secondary Transition Goals and Services	85
Indicator #14 - Post-school	89
Indicator #15 - General Supervision	93
Indicator #16 - Complaints	101
Indicator #17 - Due Process	105
Indicator #18 - Hearing Requests	110
Indicator #19- Mediation	113
Indicator #20 - State-reported Data	116
Attachment 1: Report of dispute resolution under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act	119

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Overview of California's State Performance Plan (SPP) Development

The contents in the State Performance Plan (SPP) are subject to modification resulting from changes in California public policy (including, but not limited to, new legislation).

This section of the SPP describes how the California Department of Education (CDE) met the requirements to obtain broad input from stakeholders and disseminate the completed SPP to the public.

The U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) finalized requirements under the SPP on August 10, 2005; among the requirements is a final due date for the report of December 2, 2005. During this brief time period, CDE completed the SPP, with broad stakeholder support as described below:

- The draft SPP requirements were presented and discussed during the summer 2005 meeting of the Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), a comprehensive stakeholder group comprised of parents, advocates, special education staff, professional organizations, and administrator groups. Members of the KPISC provided input to the development of the SPP.
- During the summer of 2005, the draft SPP requirements were shared with a Statewide Preschool Stakeholder Committee (PSC). The PSC focused on the Part B indicators specific to preschool students. The presenters during the PSC meeting included the Branch Manager of the California Department of Developmental Services, the lead agency for Part C; the Early Childhood Outcomes Center; and the California Services for Technical Assistance and Training (CalSTAT), which is a project of the CDE, Special Education Division (SED).
- The SPP requirements were presented at a meeting of the California Advisory Commission on Special Education September on 22, 2005. The Commission is an advisory body providing recommendations and advice to the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Legislature, and the Governor in new or continuing areas of research, program development and evaluation in California special education. The Advisory Commission consists of appointed members from the Speaker of the Assembly, Senate Committee on Rules, Governor, and the State Board of Education, as well as parents, persons with disabilities, persons knowledgeable about the administration of special education, teachers, and legislative representatives from the Assembly and Senate.
- The SPP requirements were presented at two separate California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) training sessions with the special education local plan area (SELPA) administrators and local educational agencies (LEA)/districts during the fall of 2005. CASEMIS is the primary data reporting and retrieval system for special education student-level data in the State of California.
- The requirements under the SPP were shared during the September monthly SELPA meeting as part of a broader discussion about new data collection requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004.
- Two stakeholder meetings with parents were held during October 2005, where the SPP was the focus. One meeting was held in Northern California and one in

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Southern California. Parents gained knowledge about the SPP requirements and shared their input.

- A draft of the SPP was presented to the State Board of Education for approval during the November 2005 meeting.

CDE staff participated in numerous calls with the OSEP and technical assistance centers to gain a better understanding of, and to provide feedback on the proposed SPP requirements. The SED Director and staff attended the OSEP Summer Institute in August 2005, where the primary focus was on the SPP requirements. CDE staff have spent countless hours gathering data, convening meetings to discuss effective strategies to address the SPP requirements, reconfiguring CASEMIS, preparing and making presentations, addressing questions and comments from the public, and writing the SPP.

The CDE will disseminate the final SPP to the public via the department's Web site.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #1 - Graduation

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Indicator - Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A)).

Measurement: The number of students receiving special education who graduated with a diploma divided by the number of special education students exited (students reported as returning to regular education or deceased are excluded from this calculation). Only students in the 12th grade or age 18 or older are included in this calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

The requirements to graduate with a regular diploma in California are the same for all students. The methods for calculating the graduation rate for students receiving special education differ from the methods used by general education in California. Through the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS), the Special Education Division (SED) collects information about individual students receiving special education. This allows SED to calculate the proportion of exiting students who graduate; general education calculates a cohort rate based on aggregate numbers.

General education calculates graduation as the number of twelfth-grade graduates who received a diploma in the school year indicated, or the summer following that year, divided by the number of students in grade 9 four years ago.

Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, no student will receive a public high school diploma without having passed the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) as well as having met the district's requirements for graduation. The CAHSEE is designed to significantly improve pupil achievement in public high schools and to ensure that pupils who graduate from public high schools can demonstrate grade level competency in reading, writing, and mathematics. The CAHSEE helps identify students who are not developing skills that are essential for life after high school and encourages districts to give these students the attention and resources needed to help them achieve these skills during their high school years.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05)

Statewide, in the 2004-05 school year, 56.8 percent of students receiving special education services in California exiting from grade twelve graduated with a regular diploma. For high school districts with grades 9-12, this figure was 56.2 percent and for unified and high school districts with grades 7-12, 56.5 percent. Only students in the

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

12th grade or age 18 or older are included in this calculation. Students reported as returning to general education or deceased are not included in the calculation.

Discussion of Baseline Data

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, the California Department of Education (CDE) is responsible for establishing statewide goals and indicators to be used to measure progress toward those goals. To do this, CDE convened a comprehensive stakeholder group - the Key Performance Indicator Stakeholders Committee (KPISC). The KPISC is composed of approximately 30 advocacy, administrative, and/or professional organizations. The KPISC convenes at least twice a year to evaluate how well the state is meeting its five special education goals; to select districts for monitoring; and to identify priority areas to monitor during the reviews. The KPISC established, and CDE maintains, the system of Key Performance Indicators (KPI). These measures include graduation. The KPI measures are calculated annually at the district level and published on the Web.

The KPI measures are benchmarked, which allows for comparison of scores to a statewide expectation, for capturing the direction of change, and for comparing districts of similar type (elementary, high school and unified).

Annual benchmarks were established in consultation with the KPISC using 2003-04 data as a baseline and 2011-12 as a target year. The district-by-district distribution of graduation rates for 2003-04 was reviewed for the state overall, for high school districts with grades 9-12, and for unified and high school districts with grades 7-12 (these two school-types were analyzed by groups according to total general education enrollment size, ranging from very small through very large; starting with the 2003-04 school year, groupings based on size of K-12 enrollment are no longer used). These two school-type categories were selected because they align with California's accountability framework under NCLB. To provide greater clarity and transparency of policy, the following text describes California's benchmarking process for high school districts with grades 9-12.

In 2003-04, the lowest 25th percentile among school type (based on size of K-12 enrollment) for high school districts with grades 9-12 was 50%. This means that 75 percent of the high school districts with grades 9-12 in one of those groupings based on size had graduation rates above 50%. Based on this distribution, the baseline graduation rate for high school districts with grades 9-12 was set at the 25th percentile.

A similar process was used to establish the baseline for unified and high school districts with grades 7-12.

The long-term target for 2011-12 was set at 76 percent, the highest 75th percentile among all districts by school type only. In other words, by 2011-12, all unified and high school districts are expected to have a graduation rate at or above 76 percent. The annual benchmarks provide incremental steps through 2011-12 until the long-term goal is achieved.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

As described, prior to the additional requirements of the State Performance Plan (SPP), California had already established district-level benchmarks and targets. These district-level benchmarks and targets are provided in Table 1a.

Table 1a
California's District-level Graduation
Annual Benchmarks and Targets by District Type, 2005-12
(Percent of Students)

Year	District Type	
	High School Districts Grades 9-12	Unified and High School Districts Grades 7-12
2005-06	50	34
2006-07	51	36
2007-08	53	39
2008-09	56	45
2009-10	61	53
2010-11	67	63
2011-12	76	76

In 2003-04, 90 percent of districts in the state were at or above the statewide benchmark. Each year, the statewide benchmark is that 90% or more of districts will meet or exceed the annual graduation benchmark for the year as shown in Table 1a.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Benchmarks and Targets
2005 (2005-06)	Ninety percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks.
2006 (2006-07)	Ninety percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks
2007 (2007-08)	Ninety percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks
2008 (2008-09)	Ninety percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks
2009 (2009-10)	Ninety percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks
2010 (2010-11)	Ninety percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

The High School Initiative of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in California focuses on high expectations for all students, the development of world-class teachers and site administrators, the use of world-class instructional materials, successful transitions to postsecondary education, and the development of a community of support to nurture high achieving students. The State Superintendent's High School Summit of 2004 was followed in October 2005 by a similar summit focusing on students with disabilities.

Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects

As a Key Performance Indicator, the graduation indicator may be used in several ways. First, it may be used to identify the pool of possible districts for review. Second, the KPIs are used in all monitoring reviews to "focus" review activities on those areas where the district is below the benchmark expectation and has a KPI value lower than the prior year. In addition, the KPIs provide a resource to districts to inform and assist with self monitoring activities to address and maintain compliance.

The CDE was awarded a second State Improvement Grant (SIG2) <http://www.calstat.org/sigPcse.html> from the federal government. SIG2 will be used to improve special education services in California in several areas such as the quality and number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities, coordination of services for students with disabilities, behavioral supports available for students with disabilities, academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy, participation of parents and family members, and in the collection and dissemination of data. The grant has a significant site-based component that will include an entire network of educators who have been trained through the first SIG to assist schools in implementing research-proven behavioral approaches.

The Riverside County Achievement Teams (RCAT) use data to identify needs and to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Expert technical assistance and training is available for the selected school districts whose data indicate significantly low performance in KPIs for students with disabilities to assist in building leadership capacity. Technical assistance and training is also available through the Quality Assurance Process (QAP) focused monitoring procedures for under-performing school districts whose data indicate significantly low academic performance for students with disabilities.

Under the Reading First Program, the state budget provides incentive funding for districts to create a plan to lower the number of special education referrals based upon reading below grade level and providing alternative assistance to students. California supports this program by providing sub-grants to LEAs to implement fully the state-adopted reading program in kindergarten through grade three and to provide professional development to special education teachers. A part of the textbook adoption process is to include textbooks with a focus on early intervention and remediation for students at risk for reading problems.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Response to Intervention (RtI) is a process that focuses on early intervention designed to prevent learning failure. This approach recognizes the importance of student behavior on learning and incorporates a problem-solving process to address behavioral issues. The RtI process requires an alignment of assessment and research-based instruction to produce positive academic outcomes for students. The reliability and validity of this implementation depends on pre-service and in-service professional development models to translate research into practice. CDE will create and host presentations and trainings in the upcoming years.

Throughout the state, there are many partnerships that help to ensure that schools provide all students, including students with disabilities, with research-proven approaches to instruction, leading to the accomplishment of California's educational goals. In order to facilitate the achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets and benchmarks in California, SED has developed a close working relationship with the staff and administration of the District and School Program Coordination Office (DSPC) of the School Improvement Division within CDE. This division is responsible for, among other things, providing support and services to the schools and districts identified for program improvement (PI) under Section 1117 of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The DSPC office coordinates the funding of a Regional System of School and District Support (RSDSS), which is a statewide system of support for schools and districts in PI.

To better align the services and guidance offered by the many regional programs administered by the CDE, a Regional Programs Partnership Group (RPPG) was created in February 2005. The DSPC coordinates monthly meetings of the RPPG. The goal of this group is to share program information and to develop guidance and work toward collaboration and alignment at the state level to enhance collaboration and alignment in the field. The SED and the DSPC through the RSDSS have coordinated 3 regional trainings on improving access to the core curriculum for all students by educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. These trainings were held in September and October of 2005. Additionally, the SED assisted the DSPC in developing statewide trainings and technical assistance regarding schools and districts in PI. Future activities include attending the monthly RSDSS, RPPG, and NCLB/PI meetings and providing resources and input from the special education perspective; providing information, resources and updates from general education to appropriate SED staff and administration; working with the PI and Interventions Office to infuse the LRE district and school self assessment tools into the program improvement self assessment processes (district assistance survey (DAS) and academic performance survey (APS)).

Selected Training/Technical Assistance

Future activities also include addressing graduation requirements in bi-annual CASEMIS training sessions with special education local plan area (SELPA) Administrators and LEAs. This will improve the reliability and accuracy of data reported to CDE and will draw the attention of the LEAs to educational benefit. CDE and SELPA staffs jointly determine the content and scope of these bi-annual training sessions.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

CDE staff also will prepare and present trainings beyond CASEMIS during the six-year time period under the SPP. Topics for these trainings include: the IDEA 2004 statute and final regulations related to graduation requirements and other IDEA 2004 requirements, LRE, IEP training, leadership development, Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) positive behavioral management, Rtl, and NCLB.
Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice

CDE engages in a variety of public awareness and information dissemination activities to improve the likelihood of positively impacting practices at the school site. These activities include creating and supporting Web pages and listservs with topics ranging from promotion and retention guidelines to the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) materials, disseminating the Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics, posting data on Data Quest, and publishing data summaries.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	Ongoing	CDE staff, contractor
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports	July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2011	CDE staff
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the LRE, KPISC, and the IEP Task Force	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, CDE staff
Participate in national charter school study	2004 - 2006	University of Maryland, CDE staff, funded grant from DOE/OSEP
Selected Training/Technical Assistance		
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide regionalized training and technical assistance related to using the KPI data for PI	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Regional trainings for trainers on serving students with disabilities in the LRE	September - October, 2005 and annually as needed	CDE staff, contractor, RSDSS staff
Provide facilitated IEP training, a trainer of trainer module	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Host Riverside County Achievement Team (RCAT) teleconference	October 2005 - 06	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Leadership Development Training	February 2006	CDE staff, contractor
School-site specific RCAT Teleconference	March - June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Summer Institute	July 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Leadership Development Program follow-up Seminar	August - September 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Statewide State Improvement Grant (SIG) Leadership Institute	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
SIG Regional Leadership Institutes	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
SIG site-specific technical assistance which is specialized to assist additional schools, districts, and SELPAs	As needed by site - ongoing	CDE staff, contractor
Provide BEST positive behavioral management program training and technical assistance	Fall and Spring	CDE staff, contractor
Provide five Web casts that cover the concept of Rtl and stream this content for on-demand viewing	December 2005, January, February, March and April 2006	CDE staff, contractor, SELPA
Develop and distribute training module in DVD format that incorporates Rtl concepts and specific skills	July 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Rtl Trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff
Three-tiered model trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
State Superintendent High School Summit Focus on Students with Disabilities	October 2005	Contracted speakers support through registration fees from participants and IDEA funds, CDE staff
Develop charter school guidance primers to address the needs of students with disabilities attending charter schools	2005-06	National Association of State Directors of Special Education and grant from DOE/OSEP, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance on reinventing high school	Ongoing	International Center for Leadership in Education and Council of Chief State School Officers and financial resources provided through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance to schools focused on the implementation of reform programs to high poverty and NCLB school wide schools	September 2005 - June 2010	California Comprehensive Assistance Center, CDE staff
Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice		
Develop and maintain IDEA 2004 information Web page with links to important references and resources on the Reauthorization of the IDEA	December 2004; ongoing update	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/s/e/lr/ideareathztn.asp
IDEA Final Regulation Training	Spring 2006	Art Cernosia, Esq., nationally known expert in the IDEA. Free to public and funded from IDEA funds
Public awareness and information dissemination via Web pages and listservs on variety of topics including Promotion, retention guidelines, and CAPA materials	Updated frequently	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE
Develop Web site to support the rollout of Rtl including forms, procedures, intervention measures and provide a facility for supporting the field through an internet based message-board	June 2006	CDE staff, contractor

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Develop and disseminate Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics	Annually	CDE staff
Post special education data on CDE DataQuest Web site	Annually	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
Create and post the Special Education Data Summaries on the Web	Annually	CDE staff, Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/datarpts.asp

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #2 - Dropout

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

<p>Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).</p>

<p>Indicator - Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A)).</p>

<p>Measurement: Percent of special education students dropping out. The dropout percent for students with disabilities is calculated by taking the number of special education students identified as dropping out or not known to be continuing divided by the total number of special education students. Only students in the 7th or higher grade or age 12 or older are included in the calculation.</p>

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

The methods for calculating the dropout rate for students receiving special education services and general education are different. The Special Education Division (SED) maintains the student-level database, California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS), for students receiving special education. SED calculates a dropout percent based on exited students; general education uses a cohort rate.

Unlike the special education dropout percent, general education dropout rates are calculated from aggregate data submitted at the school-level for a variety of subgroups. The California Department of Education (CDE) calculates two different rates, a one-year rate and a four-year derived rate. Neither is comparable with the special education rate.

Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, no student will receive a public high school diploma without having passed the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) as well as having met the district's requirements for graduation. The CAHSEE is designed to significantly improve pupil achievement in public high schools and to ensure that pupils who graduate from public high schools can demonstrate grade level competency in reading, writing, and mathematics. The CAHSEE helps identify students who are not developing skills that are essential for life after high school and encourages districts to give these students the attention and resources needed to help them achieve these skills during their high school years.

With increased focus on standards-based instruction at the high school level due to implementation of the CAHSEE, passing rates continue to increase. Special attention and funding (Assembly Bill 128) are being targeted to students with disabilities to provide remediation activities.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05)

Statewide, in the 2004-05 school year, 3.97 percent of students exiting from grade seven or higher were reported as dropped out or moved and not known to be continuing. For high school districts with grades 9-12, this figure was 3.68 percent, for unified and high school districts with grades 7-12, 4.15 percent, and for elementary districts, 1.4 percent.

Discussion of Baseline Data

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, the CDE is responsible for establishing statewide goals and indicators to be used to measure progress toward those goals. To do this the CDE convened a comprehensive stakeholder group –the Key Performance Indicator Stakeholders Committee (KPISC). The KPISC is composed of approximately 30 advocacy, administrative, and/or professional organizations. The KPISC convenes at least twice a year to evaluate how well the state is meeting its five special education goals; to select districts for monitoring, and to identify priority areas to monitor during the reviews. The (KPISC) established, and CDE maintains, the system of Key Performance Indicators (KPI). These measures include dropout. The KPI measures are calculated annually at the district level and published on the Web.

The KPI measures are benchmarked, which allows for comparison of scores to a statewide expectation, for capturing the direction of change, and for comparing districts of similar type (elementary, high school and unified).

Annual benchmarks were established in consultation with the KPISC using 2003-04 data as a baseline and 2011-12 as a target year. The district-by-district distribution of drop out rates for 2003-04 was reviewed for the state overall, for high school districts with grades 9-12, for unified and high school districts with grades 7-12, and for elementary districts (these three school-types were analyzed by groups according to total general education enrollment size, ranging from very small through very large; starting with the 2003-04 school year, groupings based on size of K-12 enrollment are no longer used). These three school-type categories were selected because they align with California's accountability framework under NCLB. To provide greater clarity and transparency of policy, the following text describes California's benchmarking process for high school districts with grades 9-12 for the drop out indicator.

In 2003-04, the highest 75th percentile among school type (based on sizes of K-12 enrollment) for high school districts with grades 9-12 was 7%. This means that 75 percent of the high school districts with grades 9-12 in one of those groupings based on size had graduation rates below 7%. Based on this distribution, the baseline drop out rate for high school districts with grades 9-12 was set at the 75th percentile.

A similar process was used to establish the baseline of 8% for unified and high school districts with grades 7-12, and a baseline of 4% for elementary districts.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

The long-term target for 2011-12 was set at 0.1 percent, the lowest 25th percentile among all districts by school type only. In other words, by 2011-12, all unified, high school, and elementary districts are expected to have a drop out rate at or below 0.1 percent. The annual benchmarks provide incremental steps through 2011-12 until the long-term goal is achieved.

As described, prior to the additional requirements of the State Performance Plan (SPP), California had already established district-level benchmarks and targets. These district-level benchmarks and targets are provided in Table 2a.

Table 2a
California's District-level Dropout
Annual Benchmarks and Targets by District Type, 2005-12
(Percent of Students)

Year	District Type		
	High School Districts Grades 9-12	Unified and High School Districts Grades 7-12	Elementary School Districts
2005-06	6.8	7.9	3.8
2006-07	6.6	7.8	3.6
2007-08	5.9	7.1	3.3
2008-09	5.0	6.1	2.9
2009-10	3.8	4.6	2.3
2010-11	2.2	2.7	1.5
2011-12	0.1	0.1	0.1

In 2003-04, 85 percent of districts in the state were at or above the statewide benchmark. Each year, the percent of districts that meet or are lower than the annual benchmark for each year as shown in Table 2a will increase by one percent statewide benchmark. The final target is that 90 percent of districts will be at or below the dropout benchmark.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Benchmarks and Targets
2005 (2005-06)	Eighty-five percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks.
2006 (2006-07)	Eighty-six percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks
2007 (2007-08)	Eighty-seven percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks
2008 (2008-09)	Eighty-eight percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Benchmarks and Targets
2009 (2009-10)	Eighty-nine percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks
2010 (2010-11)	Ninety percent of districts will meet or exceed established annual benchmarks

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

The IEP, including transition services, serves as the primary avenue for drop out prevention for students receiving special education services in California in grades 7-12 (see also activities for SPP indicator #13). In addition, the activities noted in previous indicators also serve as drop out prevention strategies.

In addition to the statewide drop-out prevention activities authorized under SB65, the High School Initiative of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in California focuses on high expectations for all students, the development of world-class teachers and site administrators, the use of world-class instructional materials, successful transitions to postsecondary education, and the development of a community of support to nurture high achieving students. The State Superintendent's High School Summit of 2004 was followed in October 2005 by a similar summit with a focus on students with disabilities.

Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects

As a KPI, the drop out indicator may be used in several ways. First, it may be used to identify the pool of possible districts for review. Second, the KPIs are used in all monitoring reviews to "focus" review activities on those areas where the district is below the benchmark expectation and has a KPI value lower than the prior year.

The CDE was awarded a second State Improvement Grant (SIG2) <http://www.calstat.org/sigPcse.htm> from the federal government. SIG2 will be used to improve special education services in California in several areas such as the quality and number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities, coordination of services for students with disabilities, behavioral supports available for students with disabilities, academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy, participation of parents and family members, collection and dissemination of data. The grant has a significant site-based component that will make use of an entire network of educators who have been trained through the first SIG to assist schools in implementing research-proven behavioral approaches.

The Riverside County Achievement Teams (RCAT) use data to identify needs and to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Expert technical assistance and training is available to build leadership capacity for the selected school districts whose data indicate significantly low performance in KPIs for students with disabilities. Technical assistance and training is also available through the Quality Assurance Process (QAP) focused monitoring procedures for under-performing school districts

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

whose data indicate significantly low academic performance for students with disabilities in the LRE.

Under the Reading First Program, the state budget provides incentive funding for districts to create a plan to lower the number of special education referrals based upon reading below grade level and provides alternative assistance to students. California supports this program by providing sub-grants to LEAs to implement fully the state-adopted reading program in kindergarten through grade three and to provide professional development to special education teachers. A part of the textbook adoption process is to include textbooks with a focus on early intervention and remediation for students at risk for reading problems.

Response to Intervention (RtI) is a process that focuses on early intervention designed to prevent learning failure. This approach recognizes the importance of student behavior on learning and incorporates a problem-solving process to address behavioral issues. The RtI process requires an alignment of assessment and instruction to produce positive academic outcomes for students. The reliability and validity of this implementation depends on pre-service and in-service professional development models to translate research into practice and CDE will create and host such presentations and trainings in the upcoming years.

Throughout the state, there are many partnerships that help to ensure that schools provide all students, including students with disabilities, with research-proven approaches to instruction, leading to the accomplishment of California's educational goals. In order to facilitate the achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets and benchmarks in California, SED has developed a close working relationship with the staff and administration of the District and School Program Coordination Office (DSPC) of the School Improvement Division within CDE. This division is responsible for, among other things, providing support and services to the schools and districts identified for program improvement (PI) under Section 1117 of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The DSPC office coordinates the funding of a Regional System of School and District Support (RSDSS), which is a statewide system of support for schools and districts in PI.

To better align the services and guidance offered by the many regional programs administered by the CDE, a Regional Programs Partnership Group (RPPG) was created in February 2005. The DSPC coordinates monthly meetings of the RPPG. The goal of this group is to share program information and develop guidance and to work toward collaboration and alignment at the state level to enhance collaboration and alignment in the field. The SED and the DSPC through the RSDSS have coordinated three regional trainings on improving access to the core curriculum for all students by educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. These trainings were held in September and October of 2005. Additionally, the SED assisted the DSPC in developing statewide trainings and technical assistance regarding schools and districts in PI. Future activities include attending the monthly RSDSS, RPPG, and NCLB/PI meetings and providing resources and input from the special education perspective; providing information, resources and updates from general education to appropriate SED staff and administration; working with the PI and Interventions Office to infuse the

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

least restrictive environment (LRE) district and school self assessment tools into the program improvement self assessment processes [district assistance survey (DAS) and academic performance survey (APS)].

Selected Training/Technical Assistance

Future activities also include addressing graduation requirements in bi-annual CASEMIS training sessions with special education local plan area (SELPA) Administrators and LEAs. This will improve the reliability and accuracy of data reported to CDE and will draw the attention of the LEAs to educational benefit. CDE and SELPA staffs jointly determine the content and scope of these bi-annual training sessions. CDE staff also will prepare and present trainings beyond CASEMIS during the six-year time period under the SPP. Topics for these trainings include: the IDEA 2004 statute and final regulations related to graduation requirements and other IDEA 2004 requirements, least restrictive environment, Individualized Education Plan (IEP) training, leadership development, Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) positive behavioral management, response to intervention (RtI), and No Child Left Behind. Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice

CDE engages in a variety of public awareness and information dissemination activities to improve the likelihood of positively impacting practices at the school site. These activities include creating and supporting Web pages and listservs with topics ranging from promotion and retention guidelines to California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) materials, disseminating the Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics, posting data on Data Quest, and publishing data summaries.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, & Selected Special Projects		
Increase collaboration and coordination with SB65 on behalf of students with disabilities	Ongoing	CDE staff
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web-based applications for all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	CDE Staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	Ongoing	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports.	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2011	CDE Staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment, Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), and the IEP Task Force	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, & CDE staff
Participate in national charter school study	2004 - 2006	University of Maryland, CDE staff, funded grant from USDOE/OSEP
Selected Training/Technical Assistance		
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE Staff, SELPA, LEAs
Provide regionalized training and technical assistance related to using the KPI data for program improvement	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Regional trainings for trainers on serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment	September - October, 2005 and annually as needed	CDE Staff, contractors RSDSS staff
Provide facilitated IEP training, a trainer of trainer module	June 30, 2006	CDE Staff
Host Riverside County Achievement Team (RCAT) teleconference	October 2005 - 06	CDE Staff, contract staff
RCAT Leadership Development Training	February 2006	Contractor, CDE Staff
School-site specific RCAT Teleconference	March - June 2006	Contractor, CDE Staff
RCAT Summer Institute	July 2006	Contractor, CDE Staff
RCAT Leadership Development Program follow-up Seminar	August - September 2006	Contractor, CDE Staff
Statewide State Improvement Grant (SIG) Leadership Institute	Annually	Contractor, CDE Staff
SIG Regional Leadership Institutes	Annually	Contractor, CDE Staff
SIG site-specific technical assistance which is specialized to assist additional schools, districts, and SELPAs	As needed by site - ongoing	Contractor, CDE Staff
Provide BEST positive behavioral management program training and technical assistance	Fall and Spring	Contractor, CDE Staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide five Web-casts that cover the concept of Response to Intervention (RtI) and stream this content for on-demand viewing	December 2005, January, February, March and April 2006	Contractor, CDE Staff SELPA
Develop and distribute training module in DVD format that incorporates RtI concepts and specific skills	July 2006	CDE staff contractors
RtI Trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff
Three-tiered model trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff
State Superintendent High School Summit Focus on Students with Disabilities	October 2005	Contracted speakers support through registration fees from participants & IDEA funds, CDE Staff
Develop charter school guidance primers to address the needs of students with disabilities attending charter schools	2005 - 06	National Association of State Directors of Special Education & grant from USDOE/OSEP, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance on reinventing high school	Ongoing	International Center for Leadership in Education and Council of Chief State School Officers and financial resources provided through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance to schools focused on the implementation of reform programs to high poverty and NCLB school wide schools	Ongoing	California Comprehensive Assistance Center, CDE staff
Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice		
Develop & maintain IDEA 2004 information Web page with links to important references and resources on the Reauthorization of the IDEA	December 2004; ongoing update	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page: http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/s/e/lr/ideareathztn.asp

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
IDEA Final Regulation Training	Spring 2006	Art Cernosia, Esq., nationally known expert in the IDEA. Free to public and funded from IDEA funds
Public awareness and information dissemination via Web pages and listservs on variety of topics including promotion, retention guidelines, & CAPA materials	Updated frequently	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE
Develop Web site to support the rollout of Rtl including forms, procedures, intervention measures and provide a facility for supporting the field through an internet based message-board	June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Develop and disseminate <i>Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics</i>	Annually	CDE staff
Post special education data on CDE DataQuest Web site	Annually	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page: http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
Create and post the Special Education Data Reports on the Web	Annually	CDE staff, Web capability of CDE Web page: http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/datarpts.asp

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #3 - Statewide Assessments

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Indicator - Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a) (3) (A)).

- A. Percent of districts meeting the State's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in:
 - i. Regular assessment with no accommodations;
 - ii. Regular assessment with accommodations;
 - iii. Alternate assessment against grade level standards; and
 - iv. Alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs:
 - i. Against grade level standards; and
 - ii. Alternate achievement standards.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = number of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total number of districts in the State with numerically significant student subgroups (a school or LEA with fewer than 100 enrolled first day of testing or fewer than 100 valid scores has no numerically significant subgroups for that indicator) times 100.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
 - b. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
 - c. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
 - d. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
 - e. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above
Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.
- C. Proficiency rate =
 - a. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
 - b. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
 - c. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

by a times 100);

- d. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Tables 3b and 3c include baseline/trend data reflecting participation and performance of students with disabilities on the California Standards Tests (CSTs) used to calculate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires all districts and schools to demonstrate AYP with an eventual goal that one hundred percent of all students are proficient or above in reading/language arts (ELA) and mathematics (Math) by 2013-14. Under AYP criteria adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE), districts, schools, and numerically significant student subgroups (a school or local educational agency (LEA) with fewer than 100 enrolled first day of testing or fewer than 100 valid scores has no numerically significant subgroups for that indicator) within districts and schools must meet Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in ELA and Math, demonstrate a ninety-five percent participation rate on assessments in ELA and Math, demonstrate progress on the Academic Performance Index (API), and demonstrate progress on the graduation rate of its high school students.

California measures progress of LEAs, schools, and student subgroups against the adopted AMOs. AMOs may vary by a school's grade span e.g., elementary, middle, and high school.

Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, no student will receive a public high school diploma without having passed the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) as well as having met the district's requirements for graduation. The CAHSEE is designed to significantly improve pupil achievement in public high schools and to ensure that pupils who graduate from public high schools can demonstrate grade level competency in reading, writing, and mathematics. The CAHSEE helps identify students who are not developing skills that are essential for life after high school and encourages districts to give these students the attention and resources needed to help them achieve these skills during their high school years.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

- A. In 2004-05, 50.2 percent of districts met State's AYP objectives for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) in both ELA and math (243 of 478 districts).
- B. California's participation rate for children with IEPs is provided in Table 3b. This table indicates that of the 495,082 (100 percent participation rate) students with Individualized Education Programs (IEP) in grades assessed (those who actually took the test), 68.3 percent did so without accommodations.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10**Table 3b**

Participation of Students
Receiving Special Education Services in California, 2004-05

Assessment Description	Number	Percent
Total # Assessed	495,082	100.0%
i. Regular assessment no accommodations	338,259	68.3%
ii. Regular assessments accommodations	114,464	23.1%
iii. Alternate assessment against grade-level standards	42,359	8.6%
iv. Alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	*	*
* California does not have an alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards		

- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs provided is provided in Table 3c. This table indicates that of the 495,082 students with IEPs in grades assessed (those who actually took the test), 20.1 percent did not use accommodations and scored proficient or above. 157,693 of the 495,082 students with IEPs in grades assessed were proficient or above (31.8 percent).

Table 3c

Proficiency rate of Students
Receiving Special Education Services in California, 2004-05

Assessment Description	Number	Percent
Total # assessed	495,082	N/A
i. Regular assessment no accommodations	99,530	20.1%
ii. Regular assessments accommodations	11,180	2.3%
iii. Alternate assessment against grade-level standards	46,983	9.4%
iv. Alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	*	*
TOTAL	157,693	
* California does not have an alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards		

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Participation and performance of students with disabilities on the CSTs used to calculate AYP includes measures from the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program for grades 2-8. This includes the CST and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA), which is the alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. For the purposes of NCLB reporting, at the district and state level, results of students who take the CAPA in excess of the one

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

percent limitation will be considered “not proficient.” For grade ten, CAHSEE and CAPA are used to calculate AYP. In order to use the CAHSEE for this purpose, separate cut scores have been established for both the ELA and Math portions of the assessment. These cut scores do not correspond to scores on the CAHSEE; instead, they reflect the more rigorous CST performance levels. These more rigorous cut scores are for NCLB purposes only, and will not be used to determine passing scores on the CAHSEE.

While California has made significant progress in both participation rate and percent scoring proficient in the statewide standards-based assessments, the achievement gap that exists between special and general education remains. Special education students have made impressive gains, and we must continue to increase achievement gains for this population. These gains may be attributed to technical assistance and training provided to the field in the areas of the appropriate use of alternate assessments, the continued integration of special education students in the state adopted core curriculum, continued emphasis on educating all students in the least restrictive environment (LRE), continued improvement of data collection methods, and continued technical assistance regarding the use of accommodations.

Measurable and Rigorous Benchmarks and Target

3A. Annual benchmarks and six-year target for the percent of districts meeting the State’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for progress for the disability subgroup are provided in the cells below.

FFY	% of Districts
2005 (2005-06)	52
2006 (2006-07)	54
2007 (2007-08)	56
2008 (2008-09)	58
2009 (2009-10)	60
2010 (2010-11)	62

3B. The annual benchmark and target for participation on statewide assessments in ELA and Math, 95 percent (rounded to nearest whole number), is established under NCLB.

3C. Consistent with NCLB accountability framework, the 2005-11 AMOs (benchmarks) for the percent proficient on statewide assessments are broken down by school subgroup and are provided in the cells below.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	School Subgroup	English Language Arts	Math
2005 (2005-06)	Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Elementary School Districts	24.4%	26.5%
	High Schools, High School Districts	22.3%	20.9%
	Unified School Districts, High School Districts, County Office of Education	23.0%	23.7%
2006 (2006-07)	Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Elementary School Districts	24.4%	26.5%
	High Schools, High School Districts	22.3%	20.9%
	Unified School Districts, High School Districts, County Office of Education	23.0%	23.7%
2007 (2007-08)	Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Elementary School Districts	35.2%	37.0%
	High Schools, High School Districts	33.4%	32.2%
	Unified School Districts, High School Districts, County Office of Education	34.0%	34.6%
2008 (2008-09)	Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Elementary School Districts	46.0%	47.5%
	High Schools, High School Districts	44.5%	43.5%
	Unified School Districts, High School Districts, County Office of Education	45.0%	45.5%
2009 (2009-10)	Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Elementary School Districts	56.8%	58.0%
	High Schools, High School Districts	55.6%	54.8%
	Unified School Districts, High School Districts, County Office of Education	56.0%	56.4%
2010 (2010-11)	Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Elementary School Districts	67.6%	68.5%
	High Schools, High School Districts	66.7%	66.1%
	Unified School Districts, High School Districts, County Office of Education	67.0%	67.3%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

These activities targeting student participation and performance on statewide assessments are also expected to help improve and support other SPP indicators such

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

as increasing the percent of students graduating with a diploma and decreasing the decreasing the percent of students dropping out.

The California Department of Education (CDE) will continue to provide training and technical assistance to IEP teams when making statewide assessment participation decisions, including the use of accommodations, modifications, and alternate assessments. The Special Education Division (SED) will promote and support the use of standards-based instruction for all students, including students with disabilities. The SED supports AB 564 (was received by the Governor's office on September 6, 2005) which would require the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to create and implement a process to review high school basic instructional materials (grades 9-12) to ensure alignment with academic content standards and create a list of recommended materials. The Special Education Data Reports for each LEA are part of a series of initiatives by CDE to help disseminate educational data, improve the quality of education programs, and help districts track changes over time.

In order to meet the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) and NCLB, California must show evidence that all students are included in its statewide assessment and accountability system. To assist in facilitating this process, CDE recruited experts from the field to participate in the development of blueprints for a new alternate assessment for up to two percent of students who are unable to demonstrate proficiency on the state's academic content standards and who, research indicates, would not respond well to interventions for helping them to improve their achievement. The two percent is a new option states may be able to take advantage of upon U.S. Department of Education (ED) approval. This percentage is in addition to up to one percent of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who currently participate in STAR program by CAPA.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction in California had initiated a High School Initiative. This Initiative focuses on high expectations for all students, the development of world-class teachers and site administrators, the use of world-class instructional materials, successful transitions to postsecondary education, and the development of a community of support to nurture high achieving students. The State Superintendent's High School Summit of 2004 was followed in October 2005 by a similar summit with a focus on students with disabilities.

Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects

As a Key Performance Indicator (KPI), the STAR Assessment indicator may be used in several ways. First, it may be used to identify the pool of possible districts for review. Second, the KPIs are used in all monitoring reviews to "focus" review activities on those areas where the district is below the benchmark expectation and has a KPI value lower than the prior year. In addition, the KPIs provide a resource to districts to inform and assist with self monitoring activities to address and maintain compliance. The SED will continue to monitor participation in statewide assessments and the relationship between IEPs and student outcomes (educational benefit reviews).

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

The CDE was awarded a second State Improvement Grant (SIG2) <http://www.calstat.org/sigPcse.html> from the federal government. The SIG2 will be used to improve special education services in California in several areas such as the quality and number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities, coordination of services for students with disabilities, behavioral supports available for students with disabilities, academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy, participation of parents and family members, collection and dissemination of data. The grant has a significant site-based component that will make use of an entire network of educators who have been trained through the first SIG to assist schools in implementing research-proven behavioral approaches.

The Riverside County Achievement Teams (RCAT) use data to identify needs and to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Expert technical assistance and training is available to build leadership capacity for the selected school districts whose data indicate significantly low performance in KPIs for students with disabilities. Technical assistance and training is also available through the Quality Assurance Process (QAP) focused monitoring procedures for under-performing school districts whose data indicate significantly low academic performance for students with disabilities in the LRE.

Under the Reading First Program, the state budget provides incentive funding for districts to create a plan to lower the number of special education referrals based upon reading below grade level and provides alternative assistance to students. California supports this program by providing sub-grants to LEAs to implement fully the state-adopted reading program in kindergarten through grade three and to provide professional development to special education teachers. A part of the textbook adoption process is to include textbooks with a focus on early intervention and remediation for students at risk for reading problems.

Response to Intervention (RtI) is a process that focuses on early intervention designed to prevent learning failure. This approach recognizes the importance of student behavior on learning and incorporates a problem-solving process to address behavioral issues. The RtI process requires an alignment of assessment and instruction to produce positive academic outcomes for students. The reliability and validity of this implementation depends on pre-service and in-service professional development models to translate research into practice and CDE will create and host such presentations and trainings in the upcoming years.

Throughout the state, there are many partnerships that help to ensure that schools provide all students, including students with disabilities, with research-proven approaches to instruction, leading to the accomplishment of California's educational goals. In order to facilitate the achievement of AYP targets and benchmarks in California, SED has developed a close working relationship with the staff and administration of the District and School Program Coordination Office (DSPC) of the School Improvement Division (SID) within CDE. This division is responsible for, among other things, providing support and services to the schools and districts identified for program improvement (PI) under Section 1117 of the federal NCLB Act of 2001. The

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

DSPC office coordinates the funding of a Regional System of School and District Support (RSDSS), which is a statewide system of support for schools and districts in PI.

To better align the services and guidance offered by the many regional programs administered by the CDE, a Regional Programs Partnership Group (RPPG) was created in February 2005. The DSPC coordinates monthly meetings of the RPPG. The goal of this group is to share program information and develop guidance and to work toward collaboration and alignment at the state level to enhance collaboration and alignment in the field. The SED and the DSPC through the RSDSS have coordinated 3 regional trainings on improving access to the core curriculum for all students by educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. These trainings were held in September and October of 2005. Additionally, the SED assisted the DSPC in developing statewide trainings and technical assistance regarding schools and districts in PI. Future activities include attending the monthly RSDSS, RPPG, NCLB, and PI meetings and providing resources and input from the special education perspective; providing information, resources and updates from general education to appropriate SED staff and administration; working with the PI and Interventions Office to infuse LRE district and school self assessment tools into the program improvement self assessment processes (district assistance survey (DAS) and academic performance survey (APS)).

Selected Training/Technical Assistance

Future activities also include the STAR Assessment requirements in bi-annual California Information Management System (CASEMIS) training sessions with special education local plan area (SELPA) Administrators and LEAs. This will improve the reliability and accuracy of data reported to CDE and will draw the attention of the LEAs to educational benefit. CDE and SELPA staff jointly determine the content and scope of these bi-annual training sessions.

CDE staff also will prepare and present trainings beyond CASEMIS during the six-year time period under the SPP. Topics for these trainings include: the IDEA 2004 statute and final regulations related to graduation requirements and other IDEA 2004 requirements, LRE, IEP training, leadership development, Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) positive behavioral management, Rtl, and NCLB.

Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice

The CDE engages in a variety of public awareness and information dissemination activities to improve the likelihood of positively impacting practices at the school site. These activities include creating and supporting Web pages and listservs with topics ranging from promotion and retention guidelines to CAPA materials, disseminating the Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics, posting data on Data Quest, and publishing data summaries.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects		
Create blueprints for California Modified Assessment (CMA) (overlaps with CAPA)	May-August 2005	CAPA/CMA Workgroups, CDE staff, Contractor, ETS
Develop CMA	May 2005-September 2007	CDE staff, contractor
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	Ongoing	CDE staff and contractors
The facilitated grant procedures utilize STAR data to develop program improvement plan	November 30, 2005	CDE staff
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports.	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2011	CDE staff
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment, Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), and the IEP Task Force	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, and CDE staff
Cross Branch Coordination with PI to utilize data for analysis and improvement plans	December 30, 2006	Riverside COE staff, CDE staff
Participate in national charter school study	2004 -06	University of Maryland, CDE staff, funded grant from DOE/OSEP
Selected Training/Technical Assistance		
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs.	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide regionalized training and technical assistance related to using the KPI data for program improvement	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Regional trainings for trainers on serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.	September - October, 2005 and annually as needed	CDE staff, contractors, RSDSS staff
Provide facilitated IEP training, a trainer of trainer module.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Host Riverside County Achievement Team (RCAT) teleconference	October 2005 - 2006	CDE staff, contract staff
RCAT Leadership Development Training	February 2006	CDE staff, contractor
School-site specific RCAT Teleconference	March - June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Summer Institute	July 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Leadership Development Program follow-up Seminar	August - September 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Statewide State Improvement Grant (SIG) Leadership Institute	Fall and spring	CDE staff, contractor
SIG Regional Leadership Institutes	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
SIG site-specific technical assistance which is specialized to assist additional schools, districts, and SELPAs	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
Provide BEST positive behavioral management program training and technical assistance.	As needed by site - ongoing	CDE staff, contractor
Provide five Web casts that cover the concept of Response to Intervention (RtI) and stream this content for on-demand viewing	December. 2005, January. February. March and April 2006	CDE staff, contractors, SELPA
Develop and distribute training module in DVD format that incorporates RtI concepts and specific skills.	July 2006	CDE staff, contractors
RtI Trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff
Three-tiered model trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
State Superintendent High School Summit Focus on Students with Disabilities	Oct 2005	Contracted speakers support through registration fees from participants and IDEA funds, CDE staff
Develop charter school guidance primers to address the needs of students with disabilities attending charter schools.	2005 - 2006	National Association of State Directors of Special Education and grant from DOE/OSEP, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance on reinventing high school	Ongoing	International Center for Leadership in Education and Council of Chief State School Officers and financial resources provided through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance to schools focused on the implementation of reform programs to high poverty and NCLB school wide schools.	Ongoing	California Comprehensive Assistance Center, CDE staff
Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice		
Develop and maintain IDEA 2004 information Web page with links to important references and resources on the Reauthorization of IDEA	December 2004; ongoing update	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/ideareathztn.asp
IDEA Final Regulation Training	Spring 2006	Art Cernosia, Esq., nationally known expert in the IDEA. Free to public and funded from IDEA funds
Public awareness and information dissemination via Web pages and listservs on variety of topics including Promotion, retention guidelines, and CAPA materials	Updated frequently	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE
Develop Web site to support the rollout of Rtl including forms, procedures, intervention measures and provide a facility for supporting the field through an internet based message-board	June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Develop and disseminate Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics	Annually	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Post special education data on CDE DataQuest Web site	Annually	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
Create and post the Special Education Data Reports on the Web	Annually	CDE staff, Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/datarpts.asp

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #4 - Suspension and Expulsion

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Indicator

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a) 22)).

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by # of districts in the State times 100
- B. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

California's Quality Assurance Process (QAP) is a statewide special education district-level review that focuses on both compliance and educational benefit. The QAP process allows review of all local educational agencies (LEA) in California through its four balanced components: 1) Local Plan, 2) Special Education Self Review (SESR), 3) Complaints Management, and 4) Focused Monitoring. All monitoring processes require review of multiple data sources for development of a monitoring plan. The Special Education Division (SED) uses data specific to suspension and expulsion (and other performance data) when monitoring districts. To meet the requirements of indicator 4A, the state has set the following practice in place. When a district is undergoing a review, and one percent or more of its students receiving special education or services has been expelled or suspended for more than ten days, the LEA must review all policies and practices to determine that suspension and expulsion decisions are made based on appropriate circumstances as described by federal and state laws and regulations. When the LEA has policies or practices that lead to inappropriate suspension or expulsion decisions, they must describe the changes they intend to make and provide evidence that they have done so. The state will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs in this area and impose sanctions if an LEA refuses to make necessary changes. California is developing a set of measures that will allow CDE to identify individual districts with significant discrepancies in suspension based on race or

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

ethnicity as specified in measure B. Because the number of students suspended within each LEA is usually very small, neither the index nor the composition indices work effectively for this purpose.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

In 2004-05, 83% of districts had a rate of expulsion or suspension of less than one percent.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For overall suspension or expulsion rates (indicator 4A), the state has adopted the statewide average of one percent as the threshold for action at the district level. An analysis of statewide data reveals that students from some groups are much more likely to be expelled or suspended for more than ten days. African American students in particular suffer this consequence; in 2003-04, they are more than 2.25 times as likely to be expelled or receive more than ten days of suspension than are all students receiving special education or services. When measures are developed that are appropriate to use with the relatively small numbers in some groups, district-level data will be analyzed to determine whether significant discrepancies occur across most LEAs the problem is restricted to a few.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	83.5 percent of districts will have an overall suspension or expulsion rate of less than one percent (indicator 4A). As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007 (4B).
2006 (2006-07)	84.0 percent of districts will have an overall suspension or expulsion rate of less than one percent (indicator 4A). As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007 (4B).
2007 (2007-08)	85.0 percent of districts will have an overall suspension or expulsion rate of less than one percent (indicator 4A). As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007 (4B).
2008 (2008-09)	86.5 percent of districts will have an overall suspension or expulsion rate of less than one percent (indicator 4A). As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007 (4B).

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-10)	88.0 percent of districts will have an overall suspension or expulsion rate of less than one percent (indicator 4A). As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007 (4B).
2010 (2010-11)	Ninety percent of districts will have an overall suspension or expulsion rate of less than one percent (indicator 4A). As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007 (4B).

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

When undergoing a QAP review, districts with a rate of expulsion, or suspension of their students for more than ten days, that exceeds the threshold of one percent will be required to evaluate their policies, procedures, and practices, including a review of a sample of records of those students. After benchmarks are established for the February 2007 APR, differences among rates for the various ethnic groups will be examined and included in the review process. In addition, the state will continue with the development of a measure for indicator 4B to be applied to the 2006-07 data.

California will continue to monitor district suspension and expulsion activities.

Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects

The CDE was awarded a second State Improvement Grant (SIG2)

<http://www.calstat.org/sigPcse.html> from the federal government. SIG2 will be used to improve special education services in California in several areas such as the quality and number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities, coordination of services for students with disabilities, behavioral supports available for students with disabilities, academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy, participation of parents and family members, and in the collection and dissemination of data. The grant has a significant site-based component that will include an entire network of educators who have been trained through the first SIG to assist schools in implementing research-proven behavioral approaches.

Response to Intervention (RtI) is a process that focuses on early intervention designed to prevent learning failure. This approach recognizes the importance of student behavior on learning and incorporates a problem-solving process to address behavioral issues. The RtI process requires an alignment of assessment and research-based instruction to produce positive academic outcomes for students. The reliability and validity of this implementation depends on pre-service and in-service professional development models to translate research into practice. CDE will create and host presentations and trainings in the upcoming years.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Throughout the state, there are many partnerships that help to ensure that schools provide all students, including students with disabilities, with research-proven approaches to instruction, leading to the accomplishment of California's educational goals. In order to facilitate the achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets and benchmarks in California, SED has developed a close working relationship with the staff and administration of the District and School Program Coordination Office (DSPC) of the School Improvement Division within CDE. This division is responsible for, among other things, providing support and services to the schools and districts identified for program improvement (PI) under Section 1117 of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The DSPC office coordinates the funding of a Regional System of School and District Support (RSDSS), which is a statewide system of support for schools and districts in PI.

To better align the services and guidance offered by the many regional programs administered by the CDE, a Regional Programs Partnership Group (RPPG) was created in February 2005. The DSPC coordinates monthly meetings of the RPPG. The goal of this group is to share program information and to develop guidance and work toward collaboration and alignment at the state level to enhance collaboration and alignment in the field. The SED and the DSPC through the RSDSS have coordinated 3 regional trainings on improving access to the core curriculum for all students by educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. These trainings were held in September and October of 2005. Additionally, the SED assisted the DSPC in developing statewide trainings and technical assistance regarding schools and districts in PI. Future activities include attending the monthly RSDSS, RPPG, and NCLB/PI meetings and providing resources and input from the special education perspective; providing information, resources and updates from general education to appropriate SED staff and administration; working with the PI and Interventions Office to infuse the LRE district and school self assessment tools into the program improvement self assessment processes (district assistance survey (DAS) and academic performance survey (APS)).

Selected Training/Technical Assistance

Future activities also include addressing graduation requirements in bi-annual CASEMIS training sessions with special education local plan area (SELPA) Administrators and LEAs. This will improve the reliability and accuracy of data reported to CDE and will draw the attention of the LEAs to educational benefit. CDE and SELPA staffs jointly determine the content and scope of these bi-annual training sessions. CDE staff also will prepare and present trainings beyond CASEMIS during the six-year time period under the SPP. Topics for these trainings include: the IDEA 2004 statute and final regulations related to graduation requirements and other IDEA 2004 requirements, LRE, IEP training, leadership development, Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) positive behavioral management, Rtl, and NCLB.

Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice

CDE engages in a variety of public awareness and information dissemination activities to improve the likelihood of positively impacting practices at the school site. These

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

activities include creating and supporting Web pages and listservs with topics ranging from promotion and retention guidelines to the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) materials, disseminating the Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics, posting data on Data Quest, and publishing data summaries.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide statewide California Special Education Management Information system (CASEMIS) training for special education local plan areas (SELPA).	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Finalize new suspension/expulsion data fields and definitions for CASEMIS.	Fall 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Modify CASEMIS data table structure to incorporate new data fields and update table codes.	Fall 2005	CDE staff
Modify validation codes and develop prototype reports.	Spring 2006	CDE staff
Beta-test new CASEMIS software.	Summer 2006	CDE staff
Deploy official CASEMIS software.	October 2006	CDE staff
Provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure reliable and accurate submission of data.	Ongoing throughout the year	CDE staff
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs.	Each year in the Fall and sometimes Spring	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Monitoring and Stakeholder Meetings		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS).	October 2005 - June 30, 2010	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports.	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2011	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment, Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), and the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Task Force	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, and CDE staff
Selected Training/Technical Assistance		
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs.	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Regional trainings for trainers on serving students with disabilities in the LRE	September - October, 2005 and annually as needed	CDE staff, contractors RSDSS staff
Provide facilitated IEP training, a trainer of trainer module	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Host Riverside County Achievement Team (RCAT) teleconference	October 2005 - 06	CDE staff, contract staff
RCAT Leadership Development Training	February 2006	CDE staff, contractor
School-site specific RCAT Teleconference	March - June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Summer Institute	July 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Leadership Development Program follow-up Seminar	August - September 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Statewide State Improvement Grant (SIG) Leadership Institute	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
SIG Regional Leadership Institutes	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
SIG site-specific technical assistance which is specialized to assist additional schools, districts, and SELPAs	As needed by site - ongoing	CDE staff, contractor
Provide BEST positive behavioral management program training and technical assistance	Fall and spring	CDE staff, contractor
Provide five Web casts that cover the concept of Rtl and stream this content for on-demand viewing	December. 2005, January. February. March and April 2006	CDE staff, contractors, SELPA
Develop and distribute training module in DVD format that incorporates Rtl concepts and specific skills	July 2006	CDE staff contractors

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
RtI Trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff
Three-tiered model trainings	Ongoing, several times per year	CDE staff
State Superintendent High School Summit Focus on Students with Disabilities	Oct 2005	Contracted speakers support through registration fees from participants and IDEA funds, CDE staff
Develop charter school guidance primers to address the needs of students with disabilities attending charter schools	2005-06	National Association of State Directors of Special Education and grant from DOE/OSEP, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance on reinventing high school	Ongoing	International Center for Leadership in Education and Council of Chief State School Officers and financial resources provided through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance to schools focused on the implementation of reform programs to high poverty and NCLB school wide schools	Ongoing	California Comprehensive Assistance Center, CDE staff
Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice		
Develop and maintain IDEA 2004 information Web page with links to important references and resources on the Reauthorization of the IDEA	December 2004; ongoing update	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/ideareathztn.asp
IDEA Final Regulation Training	Spring 2006	Art Cernosia, Esq., nationally known expert in the IDEA. Free to public and funded from IDEA funds
Public awareness and information dissemination via Web pages and listservs on variety of topics including promotion, retention guidelines, and CAPA materials	Updated frequently	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Develop Web site to support the rollout of Rtl including forms, procedures, intervention measures and provide a facility for supporting the field through an internet based message-board	June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Develop and disseminate Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics	Annually	CDE staff
Post special education data on CDE DataQuest Web site	Annually	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
Create and post the Special Education Data Summaries on the Web	Annually	CDE staff, Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/datarpts.asp

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #5 - Least Restrictive Environment

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Indicator –Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60 percent of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)).

Measurement:

- A. Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day. Percent is calculated by taking the number of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day and dividing by the total number of students aged 6-21 with IEPs multiplied by 100.
- B. Percent of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60 percent of the day. Percent is calculated by taking the number of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60 percent of the day and dividing by the total number of students aged 6-21 with IEPs multiplied by 100.
- C. Percent of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. Percent is calculated by taking the number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6-21 with IEPs multiplied by 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, the CDE is responsible for establishing statewide goals and indicators to be used to measure progress toward those goals. To do this the CDE convened a comprehensive stakeholder group –the Key Performance Indicator Stakeholders Committee (KPISC). The KPISC is composed of approximately 30 advocacy, administrative, and/or professional organizations. The KPISC convenes at least twice a year to evaluate how well the state is meeting its five special education goals; to select districts for monitoring, and to identify priority areas to monitor during the reviews. The (KPISC) established, and CDE maintains, the system of Key Performance Indicators (KPI). These include measures of the percent of time that students are served outside of a regular classroom. In 1996, California designated two measures of inclusion in the regular classroom: (1) the percent of students educated with their non-disabled peers 80 percent or more of the time and, (2) the percent so educated 20 percent or less of the time. These KPI measures are calculated annually at the district level and published on the Web. These measures are benchmarked which allows for comparison of scores

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

to a statewide expectation, for capturing the direction of change, and for comparing districts of similar type (elementary, high school and unified).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

Based on the December 2004 CASEMIS data reported on the 12/01/04 618 report, among the 612,177 California children aged 6-21 with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs):

- A. 49.2 percent were removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day;
- B. 24.6 percent were removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; and
- C. 4.4 percent were served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As described, prior to the additional requirements of the SPP, California had already established district-level benchmarks and targets. These district-level benchmarks and targets are incorporated into the district data summaries. Statewide annual benchmarks and six-year targets for the required SPP measures are provided.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	5A. 51.1 percent or more of students will be removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day; 5B. No more than 24 percent will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; and 5C. No more than 4.3 percent are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
2006 (2006-07)	5A. 53 percent or more of students will be removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day; 5B. No more than 23 percent will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; and 5C. No more than 4.2 percent are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
2007 (2007-08)	5A. 57 percent or more of students will be removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day; 5B. No more than 21 percent will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; and 5C. No more than 4.1 percent are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
2008 (2008-09)	5A. 62 percent or more of students will be removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day; 5B. No more than 18 percent will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; and 5C. No more than 4.0 percent are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

2009 (2009-10)	5A. 68 percent or more of students will be removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day; 5B. No more than 14 percent will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; and 5C. No more than 3.9 percent are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
2010 (2010-11)	5A. 76 percent or more of students will be removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day; 5B. No more than nine percent will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; and 5C. No more than 3.8 percent are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

This is a critical area where the SED has and will continue to devote considerable attention and resources. With the increased focus on LRE at the federal level, as emphasized in the reauthorization of IDEA 2004 and NCLB, the CDE reviewed issues surrounding LRE. Some of the many activities that CDE has undertaken and will continue as a result of this review include: reconvening a Superintendent's Task force on serving students with disabilities in the LRE, including LRE as a major focus in statewide conferences, training, and monitoring efforts, providing on-site technical assistance in working with all students in the LRE, and working closely with colleagues in general education to infuse strategies for addressing the needs of at-risk students early so that they do not require referral to special education.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction in California had initiated a High School Initiative including a strong emphasis on LRE. This Initiative focuses on high expectations for all students, the development of world-class teachers and site administrators, the use of world-class instructional materials, successful transitions to postsecondary education, and the development of a community of support to nurture high achieving students. Training took the form of the State Superintendent's High School Summit of 2004, which was followed in October 2005 by a similar summit with a focus on students with disabilities. Both included a strong focus in working with students with disabilities in the LRE.

Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects

As a KPI, the LRE indicator may be used in several ways. First, it may be used to identify the pool of possible districts for review. Second, the KPIs are used in all monitoring reviews to focus review activities on those areas where the district is below the benchmark expectation and has a KPI value lower than that of the prior year. In addition, the KPIs provide a resource to districts to inform and assist with self-monitoring activities to address and maintain compliance.

The CDE was awarded a second State Improvement Grant (SIG2) <http://www.calstat.org/sigPcse.html> from the federal government. SIG2 will be used to improve special education services in California in several areas such as the quality and number of teachers and other personnel who work with students with disabilities in the

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

LRE, coordination of services for students with disabilities, behavioral supports available for students with disabilities, academic outcomes, especially in the area of literacy, participation of parents and family members, and collection and dissemination of data. The grant has a significant site-based component that will make use of an entire network of educators who have been trained through the first SIG to assist schools in implementing research-proven practices.

The Riverside County Achievement Teams (RCAT) use data to identify needs and to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Expert technical assistance and training is available to build leadership capacity for the selected school districts whose data indicate significantly low performance in KPIs for students with disabilities. Technical assistance and training is also available through the Quality Assurance Process (QAP) focused monitoring procedures for under-performing school districts whose data indicate significantly low academic performance for students with disabilities in the LRE.

Under the Reading First Program, the state budget provides incentive funding for districts to create a plan to lower the number of special education referrals based upon reading below grade level and provides alternative assistance to students enabling students to be served in the general education classroom. California supports this program by providing sub-grants to LEAs to implement fully the state-adopted reading program in kindergarten through grade three and to provide professional development to special education teachers. A part of the textbook adoption process is to include textbooks with a focus on early intervention and remediation for students at risk for reading problems.

Response to Intervention (RtI) is a process that focuses on early intervention in the general education classroom in order to prevent learning failure. This approach recognizes the importance of student behavior on learning and incorporates a problem-solving process to address behavioral issues. The RtI process requires an alignment of assessment and instruction to produce positive academic outcomes for students. The reliability and validity of this implementation depends on pre-service and in-service professional development models to translate research into practice and CDE will create and host such presentations and trainings in the upcoming years.

Throughout the state, there are many partnerships that help to ensure that schools provide all students, including students with disabilities, with research-proven approaches to instruction in the LRE, leading to the accomplishment of California's educational goals. In order to facilitate the achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets and benchmarks in California, the Special Education Division (SED) has developed a close working relationship with the staff and administration of the District and School Program Coordination Office (DSPC) of the School Improvement Division (SID) within CDE. This division is responsible for, among other things, providing support and services to the schools and districts identified for program improvement (PI) under Section 1117 of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The DSPC office coordinates the funding of a Regional System of School and District Support (RSDSS), which is a statewide system of support for schools and districts in PI.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

To better align the services and guidance offered by the many regional programs administered by the CDE, a Regional Programs Partnership Group (RPPG) was created in February 2005. The DSPC coordinates monthly meetings of the RPPG. The goal of this group is to share program information and develop guidance and to work toward collaboration and alignment at the state level to enhance collaboration and alignment in the field. The SED and the DSPC through the RSDSS have coordinated three regional trainings on improving access to the core curriculum for all students by educating students with disabilities in the LRE. These trainings were held in September and October of 2005. Additionally, the SED assisted the DSPC in developing statewide trainings and technical assistance regarding schools and districts in PI. Future activities include attending the monthly RSDSS, RPPG, and NCLB/PI meetings and providing resources and input from the special education perspective; providing information, resources, and updates from general education to appropriate SED staff and administration; working with the PI and Interventions Office to infuse the LRE district and school self assessment tools into the program improvement self assessment processes (district assistance survey (DAS) and academic performance survey (APS)).

Selected Training/Technical Assistance

Future activities also include addressing LRE in bi-annual CASEMIS training sessions with special education local plan area (SELPA) administrators and LEAs. This will improve the reliability and accuracy of data reported to CDE and will draw the attention of the LEAs to educational benefit. CDE and SELPA staffs jointly determine the content and scope of these bi-annual training sessions.

CDE staff also will prepare and present trainings beyond CASEMIS during the six-year time period under the SPP. Topics for these trainings include: the IDEA 2004 statute and final regulations related to graduation requirements and other IDEA 2004 requirements, LRE, Individualized Education Plan (IEP) training, leadership development, Building Effective Schools Together (BEST) positive behavioral management, Rtl, and NCLB.

Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice

CDE engages in a variety of public awareness and information dissemination activities to improve the likelihood of positively impacting practices at the school site. These activities include creating and supporting Web pages and listservs with topics ranging from working with students in the LRE, promotion and retention guidelines, California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) materials, disseminating the Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics, posting data on Data Quest, and publishing data summaries.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
The facilitated grant procedures utilize LRE data to develop program improvement strategies	November 30, 2005	CDE staff
Add monthly progress reporting to corrective actions for systemic non-compliance findings related to LRE	December 30, 2005 - June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	Ongoing	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports	July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2011	CDE staff
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment, Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), and the IEP Task Force	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, and CDE staff
Participate in national charter school study	2004-06	University of Maryland, CDE staff, funded grant from DOE/OSEP
Selected Training/Technical Assistance		
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Provide regionalized training and technical assistance related to using the KPI data for program improvement	June 30, 2006	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Regional trainings for trainers on serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment	September-October, 2005 and annually as needed	CDE staff, contractors, RSDSS staff
Provide facilitated IEP training, a trainer of trainer module	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Host Riverside County Achievement Team (RCAT) teleconference	October 2005-06	CDE staff, contract staff
RCAT Leadership Development Training	February 2006	CDE staff, contractor
School-site specific RCAT Teleconference	March-June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Summer Institute	July 2006	CDE staff, contractor
RCAT Leadership Development Program follow-up Seminar	August-September 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Statewide State Improvement Grant (SIG) Leadership Institute	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
SIG Regional Leadership Institutes	Annually	CDE staff, contractor
SIG site-specific technical assistance which is specialized to assist additional schools, districts, and SELPAs	As needed by site - ongoing	CDE staff, contractor
Provide BEST positive behavioral management program training and technical assistance	Fall and spring	CDE staff, contractor
Provide five Web casts that cover the concept of Response to Intervention (RtI) and stream this content for on-demand viewing	December 2005, January. February. March and April 2006	CDE staff, contractors SELPA
Develop and distribute training module in DVD format that incorporates RtI concepts and specific skills.	July 2006	CDE staff contractors
RtI Trainings focused on general education environment	Ongoing; several times per year	CDE staff
Three-tiered model trainings	Ongoing; several times per year	CDE staff
State Superintendent High School Summit Focus on Students with Disabilities	Oct 2005	Contracted speakers support through registration fees from participants and IDEA funds, CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Develop charter school guidance primers to address the needs of students with disabilities attending charter schools	2005-06	National Association of State Directors of Special Education and grant from DOE/OSEP, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance on reinventing high school	Ongoing	International Center for Leadership in Education and Council of Chief State School Officers and financial resources provided through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, CDE staff
Provide technical assistance to schools focused on the implementation of reform programs to high poverty and NCLB school wide schools	Ongoing	California Comprehensive Assistance Center, CDE staff
Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice		
Develop and maintain IDEA 2004 information Web page with links to important references and resources on the Reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	December 2004; ongoing update	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/s/p/se/lr/ideareathztn.asp
IDEA Final Regulation Training	Spring 2006	Art Cernosia, Esq., nationally known expert in the IDEA. Free to public and funded from IDEA funds
Public awareness and information dissemination via Web pages and listservs on variety of topics including LRE	Updated frequently	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE
Develop Web site to support the rollout of Rtl including forms, procedures, intervention measures and provide a facility for supporting the field through an internet based message-board	June 2006	CDE staff, contractor
Develop and disseminate Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics	Annually	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Post special education data on CDE DataQuest Web site	Annually	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
Create and post the Special Education Data Summaries on the Web	Annually	CDE staff, Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/spe/se/ds/datarpts.asp

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #6 - Preschool Least Restrictive Environment

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).
Indicator - Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)).
Measurement: The number of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

It is the policy of the State of California that "Special education is an integral part of the total public education system and provides education in a manner that promotes maximum interaction between children or youth with disabilities and children or youth who are not disabled, in a manner that is appropriate to the needs of both."

"Special education provides a full continuum of program options, including instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions, and in other settings; and instruction in physical education, to meet the educational and service needs of individuals with exceptional needs in the least restrictive environment [30 *Education Code* (EC) 56031]." Further, state law requires that the student's IEP include: "The specific special educational instruction and related services and supplementary aids and services to be provided to the pupil, or on behalf of the pupil, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided for the pupil in order to ...be educated and participate with other pupils with disabilities and nondisabled pupils in the activities described in this section. " and also "An explanation of the extent, if any, to which the pupil will not participate with nondisabled pupils in regular classes and in... (extracurricular and other nonacademic) activities (30 EC 56345)." In addition, each SELPA must ensure that a continuum of program options is available to meet the needs of individuals with exceptional needs for special education and related services, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 (IDEA). The continuum of program options is specified in law. These requirements apply to all individuals with exceptional needs, age three to twenty two.

In addition, the California EC includes requirements more suited to the preschool service delivery system. The code specifies a number of appropriate settings, including:

- (a) The regular public or private nonsectarian preschool program.
- (b) The child development center or family day care home.
- (c) The child's regular environment that may include the home.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

- (d) A special site where preschool programs for both children with disabilities and children who are not disabled are located close to each other and have an opportunity to share resources and programming.
- (e) A special education preschool program with children who are not disabled attending and participating for all or part of the program.
- (f) A public school setting which provides an age-appropriate environment, materials, and services, as defined by the superintendent. (30 EC 56441.4)

And the law identifies a variety of methods by which services to preschool age children with disabilities may be provided:

- (a) Directly by a local educational agency.
- (b) Through an interagency agreement between a local educational agency and another public agency.
- (c) Through a contract with another public agency pursuant to Section 56369.
- (d) Through a contract with a certified nonpublic, nonsectarian school; or nonpublic, nonsectarian agency pursuant to Section 56366.
- (e) Through a contract with a nonsectarian hospital. (30 EC 56441.8)

Level at which local data will be reported: There are approximately 1,100 LEAs in the state of California. They vary in size from one-room schoolhouses to very large districts in cities like Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego. The CDE's experience with calculating Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is that there are many districts with such a small population that the calculation of a percentage is meaningless. This situation is even more difficult when calculating percentages for preschool age children because they are so much less populous than the group of students who are 6-21 years of age. In addition, not every LEA serves the same population of students. Within the SELPA structure, one district may serve all of the severely involved students, another may serve blind students, and a third may serve students with autism. Comparing districts who serve different populations is not very useful. As a result, CDE is planning to calculate and report outcome data at the SELPA level, because SELPAs are of sufficient size to generate a meaningful statistic and SELPA-to-SELPA comparisons are more meaningful to the overall preschool population.

Data Source: Data for determining the values for this indicator are drawn from the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). CASEMIS includes data for each preschool age child related to program setting for preschool special education services. Calculations for 2004-05 will be based on December 2004 CASEMIS data for children reported to be served in early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

The overall percentage of preschool age students served in settings with typically developing peers is 48 percent. Table 6a provides data used for this calculation.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Table 6a
Preschool LRE data in California, 2004-05

Setting	Number of 3 - 5 year olds
Early childhood setting	19,514
Home	1,287
Part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education setting	8,052
Subtotal	28,853
Total Number of 3-5 Served	59,937
Percent 3-5 served in settings with typically developing peers	48.14%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data presented in table 6a are based on December 2004 CASEMIS data for three, four and five year-old children with disabilities. The overall percentage of preschool age students served in settings with typically developing peers is 48 percent. The three preschool settings included in the calculation are not exhaustive and as such preschool students do receive services in other settings as described in the text on pages 58 and 59. Targets are set to increase to an overall target of 66 percent in 2010-11. These benchmarks will be finalized in the APR due February 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	51% of the 3-5 year olds will be served in settings with typically developing peers.
2006 (2006-07)	54% of the 3-5 year olds will be served in settings with typically developing peers.
2007 (2007-08)	57% of the 3-5 year olds will be served in settings with typically developing peers.
2008 (2008-09)	60% of the 3-5 year olds will be served in settings with typically developing peers.
2009 (2009-10)	63% of the 3-5 year olds will be served in settings with typically developing peers.
2010 (2010-11)	66% of the 3-5 year olds will be served in settings with typically developing peers.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Future activities also include addressing preschool LRE requirements in bi-annual CASEMIS training sessions with special education local plan area (SELPA) administrators and LEAs. This step will improve the reliability and accuracy of data reported to CDE and will draw the attention of the LEAs to educational benefit. CDE and SELPA staffs jointly determine the content and scope of these bi-annual training sessions.

Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice

CDE engages in a variety of public awareness and information dissemination activities to improve the likelihood of positively impacting practices at the school site. These activities include supporting Web pages and listservs with topics ranging from promotion and retention guidelines to the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) materials, disseminating the Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics, posting data on Data Quest, and publishing data summaries.

Activities	Timelines	Resources
Review individual SELPA and LEA calculations. Identify extreme, outlying values.	By January 1, 2006	CDE staff
Prepare and disseminate general policy letter related to preschool LRE.	By January 1, 2006	CDE staff
Contact districts with extreme, outlying values to monitor policies, procedures and practices; and to provide technical assistance.	By January 1, 2006	CDE staff
Conduct monitoring; prepare corrective action plans, if needed; and follow-up to ensure correction.	By June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Work with preschool technical assistance contractors to prepare and disseminate technical assistance materials and services.	By June 30, 2006	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct ongoing review of APR data calculations and prepare annual action plans.	July 2006 through June 30, 2011	CDE staff and contractors
Convene Preschooler Stakeholder Committee to review data	2005 - 2007	CDE staff and contractors
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005; annually	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Activities	Timelines	Resources
Public Reporting/Data Awareness/Data Utilized to Reflect Upon Practice		
Develop and maintain IDEA 2004 information Web page with links to important references and resources on the Reauthorization of the IDEA	December 2004; ongoing update	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/s/p/se/lr/ideareathztn.asp
IDEA Final Regulation Training	Spring 2006	Art Cernosia, Esq., nationally known expert in the IDEA. Free to public and funded from IDEA funds
Public awareness and information dissemination via Web pages and listservs on variety of topics	Updated frequently	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE
Develop and disseminate Pocketbook of Special Education Statistics	Annually	CDE staff
Post special education data on CDE DataQuest Web site	Annually	CDE/SED staff; Web capability of CDE Web page http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
Create and post the Special Education Data Summaries on the Web	Annually	CDE staff, Web capability of CDE Web page http://www.cde.ca.gov/s/p/se/ds/datarpts.asp

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #7 - Preschool Assessment

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment

Indicator - Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)).

Measurement:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
 - a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = number of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improve functioning = number of preschool children who improved functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a.
- Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c
- 1. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
 - a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = number of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = number of preschool children who improved functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
 - a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = number of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = number of preschool children who improved functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c.
- If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The California Department of Education (CDE) has been developing a statewide system of progress assessment for young children since the mid-1990s. This system - the Desired Results (DR) system - includes a set of DR (standards) and a method for assessing child progress known as the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP). Children with disabilities have been included in the development of DR and DRDP since its inception. Accommodations and adaptations of the regular DRDP have been developed and researched along with the base instrument. In 2001, DR was reconceptualized to provide greater psychometric integrity. The base constructs were researched and revised and a new set of items developed to conform to the underlying constructs. The indicators and measures have been extensively researched on young children including young children with disabilities. As a part of this research and development effort CDE has also initiated the development of preschool learning standards for literacy and mathematics, aligned to the state standards for school age children.

In January 2005, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction announced a major preschool initiative in his state of the state address. This initiative, the Preschool for all Initiative includes, among other things, a major focus on accountability, which has prompted an additional focus on the development of standards and the implementation of the systems of assessment. It is anticipated that the Child Development Division (CDD) of CDE will implement the new version of DRDP in the fall of 2006, and will subsequently make adjustments to DRDP. Typically research on the adaptations to DRDP lag one year behind the basic instrument (as adaptations are made and tested subsequent to the evaluation of the base instrument). In 2004-05, CDE anticipated providing baseline, status data (one data point) from a sample of districts related to the developmental improvement of preschool age children using the prior indicators in the Annual Performance Report (APR). However, the indicators have changed and, as a result, CDE only has one data point for 2004-05.

In anticipation of the data requirements for 2005-06 and implementation of state standards for literacy and mathematics, the Special Education Division (SED) funded 11 districts and county offices of education, among other things, to pilot a birth-to-five instrument and to provide two data points for three, four, and five year-old children with disabilities. Shasta County Office of Education

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

These districts represent urban, suburban and rural settings and include large, small and moderately sized programs. They were funded in the spring of 2005, prior to elaboration of SPP requirements.

In July 2005, CDE convened a meeting (Preschool Stakeholders Committee (PSC)) of representatives from early childhood programs, early childhood training and technical assistance contractors, representatives from the Department of Developmental Services (lead agency for Part C) and staff of the ECO center to review the requirements and provide input into the State Performance Plan. In October 2005, CDE convened the same group to update input on the updated requirements.

General Considerations. The methodology for providing early childhood outcome data is derived from a variety of considerations. First, SPP requires that CDE and LEAs provide information about the developmental progress of three, four, and five year-olds with disabilities between entry and exit from the program. On this basis, CDE and LEAs need to be prepared to provide data in relation to the following entry and exit conditions:

	Exit at 3	Exit at 4	Exit at 5
Entry at 3	X	X	X
Entry at 4		X	X
Entry at 5			X

Oftentimes, exit is a post hoc finding - the child has left before the usual transition after kindergarten or at the end of a year and the LEA is not aware of the fact until the child fails to return to the program. In addition, IDEA requires that children with disabilities participate in state and local assessment programs. When DRDP is redeployed statewide, it will constitute a statewide testing program for all typically developing three and four year-olds that are served by CDE. This will require CDE and LEAs to include all three and four year-olds with disabilities in the statewide assessment program for DR. Children are assessed two times per year using DRDP - once in the fall and once in the spring. This would have the effect of requiring all three and four year-olds with disabilities to be assessed twice a year, but not five year-olds. But, because all five year-olds exit from preschool, all five year-olds would need to be assessed in the spring. There are many five year-olds who enter special education for the first time that would need to be assessed in the fall. As a result, all three, four, and five year-olds with disabilities will be assessed two times per year, once in the fall and once in the spring to comply with the SPP requirements. The entry data for a child will be drawn from DRDP results in the test period following entry into the program. The exit data will be drawn from DRDP results in the test period immediately preceding the child's withdrawal from the program or spring results in kindergarten.

It is of paramount importance that these data be reliable, accurate and useful at the local, state and national levels. CDE could easily have met APR requirements for a summary of developmental status and progress within the timelines described in the 2003-04 APR. As planned in the 2003-04 APR, calibration studies for DRDP and studies targeted on language development, literacy, and social emotional development

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

were completed. However, with the addition of entry and exit requirements and the comparison to developmental progress of typically developing children, there is a mismatch between the plans for development of elements of DRDP between CDD (which is targeting further major research studies upon release of the proposed literacy and mathematic standards in 2006-07) and SED (which has an urgent need for increased information about the performance of typically developing three, four, and five year-olds using the current DRDP instruments in 2005-06). Additionally, the DRDP information measures for five year olds are drawn from a school-age instrument, which uses examples from after school child care settings rather than regular kindergarten or preschool classrooms. This will require SED to redesign the five year-old measure to be more suited to a classroom base and to conduct extensive research on a sample of typically developing five year-olds. To get this work done, SED is contracting with Sonoma State University and is in the contracting process with Berkeley Evaluation and Assessment Research Center at the University of California, Berkeley (BEAR). BEAR has conducted all of the in-depth statistical work to validate DRDP for CDD. They maintain the ongoing data sets for typically developing children. Sonoma State and BEAR will be working together in 2005-06 to scale DRDP to include children with disabilities in relation to data collected in 2004-05. They will also work together to develop the sampling and statistical analysis needed to calibrate the birth-to-five year-old instrument piloted in 2005-06 and to update a five year-old instrument for children with disabilities in 2006-07. Both of these studies will require SED to secure a large sample of typically developing children prior to the time that CDD will be recalibrating the DRDP to include the new standards. These timeline issues will affect CDE's ability to collect comprehensive entry data until spring of 2007 and comprehensive baseline data until 2007-08.

One issue during input was the level at which local data would be reported: There are approximately 1,100 LEAs in the state of California. They vary in size from one-room schoolhouses to very large districts in cities like Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego. CDE's experience with calculating Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is that there are many districts with such a small population that the calculation of a percentage is meaningless. This fact is even more troubling when calculating percentages for preschool age children as they are so much less populous than the group of students who are 6-21 years of age. In addition, not every serves the same population of students. Within the SELPA structure, one district may serve all of the severely involved students, another may serve blind students, and a third may serve students with autism. Comparing districts who serve different populations is not very useful. As a result, is planning to calculate and report outcome data at the SELPA level, as SELPAs are of sufficient size to generate a meaningful statistic and SELPA to SELPA comparisons are more meaningful to the overall preschool population.

Summary of the outcome measurement system: When the system is fully implemented, all three, four, and five year-old children with disabilities will be assessed using DRDP as determined by their IEP team. Children will be assessed in the fall and the spring by special education personnel, familiar with their skills, and in conjunction with their regular teacher, child care provider and/or their parent - as appropriate to their service settings. Children will be assessed by staff who have been trained to conduct the assessments, using adaptations as appropriate to the child's special education needs.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

To ensure proper training CDE will provide ongoing training to program administrators through the annual conference sponsored by the Special Education Early Childhood Administrators Project (SEECAP). Administrator training will begin with the winter 2006 conferences. staff training will be provided through several means. A series of regional trainings will be provided in the fall 2006 by Sonoma State University in collaboration with the Supporting Early Education Delivery System (SEEDS) and representatives from the network of projects funded to pilot the birth-to-five DRDP instrument. Ongoing support will be coordinated by Sonoma State University through the SEEDS project that will house expert teams in their visitation sites and through their statewide network of core consultants. Web based training and teleconferences are also proposed for fall 2006.

How DRDP indicators and measures will be used to produce the required information. DRDP consists of four DRs for children:

- Children are personally and socially competent,
- Children are effective learners,
- Children show physical and motor competence, and
- Children are safe and healthy.

Within each DR there are indicators and a series of measures for each indicator. The following is the method that will be used to roll up data on an indicator basis collected on the DRDP for the three outcomes: (1) positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships, (2) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy, and (3) use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs.

For 2004-05 data presented below, children were observed on the calibration study version of the DRDP and the corresponding DRDP access provides accommodations for children with disabilities to be observed on the DRDP. This required children to be assessed using both the infant-toddler items and the preschool items. A list of indicators and measures that roll up to the three outcomes from the infant-toddler and the preschool instruments are provided in Table 7a and table 7b respectively.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10**Table 7a.**

Desired Results Developmental Profile access: Infant-Toddler Instrument

Outcome 1: Positive Social-Emotional Skills	Outcome 2: Knowledge and Skills	Outcome 3: Action to Meet Needs
<u>Desired Result 1</u> Self Concept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity of Self and Connection to Others • Recognition of Ability • Self-Expression • Awareness of Diversity Social and Interpersonal Skills: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empathy • Interactions with Adults • Relationships with Familiar Adults • Interactions with Peers • Relationships with Familiar Peers Self-Regulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impulse Control • Seeking Other's Help to Regulate Self • Responsiveness to Other's Support • Self-Comforting • Attention Maintenance 	<u>Desired Result 1</u> Language: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Comprehension • Responsiveness to Language • Communication of Needs, Feelings, and Interests • Reciprocal Communication <u>Desired Result 2</u> Cognitive Competence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memory • Cause and Effect • Problem Solving • Symbolic Play • Curiosity Math: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number • Space and Size • Classification and Matching • Time Literacy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in Literacy • Recognition of symbols 	<u>Desired Result 3</u> Motor Skills: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gross Motor • Balance • Fine Motor • Eye-Hand Coordination <u>Desired Result 4</u> Safety and Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal Care Routines • Safety

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10**Table 7b.**

Desired Results Developmental Profile Access: Preschool Instrument

Outcome 1: Positive Social-Emotional Skills	Outcome 2: Knowledge and Skills	Outcome 3: Action to Meet Needs
<u>Desired Result 1</u> Self Concept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity of Self • Recognition of Own Skills and Accomplishments Social and Interpersonal Skills: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressions of Empathy • Building Cooperative Relationships with Adults • Building Cooperative Play with Other Children • Developing Friendships • Conflict Negotiation • Awareness of Diversity in Self and Others Self-Regulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impulse Control • Taking Turns • Shared Use of Space and Materials 	<u>Desired Result 1</u> Language: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehends Meaning • Follows Increasingly Complex Instructions • Expresses Self Through Language • Uses Language in Conversation <u>Desired Result 2</u> Learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curiosity and Initiative • Engagement and Persistence Cognitive Competence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memory and Knowledge • Cause and Effect • Engages in Problem Solving • Socio-dramatic Play Math: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number sense: Understands Quantity and Counting • Number Sense: Math Operations • Shapes • Classification • Measurement • Patterning • Time Literacy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in Literacy • Concepts of Print • Letter and Word Knowledge • Phonological Awareness • Emerging Writing 	<u>Desired Result 3</u> Motor Skills: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gross Motor Movement • Balance • Fine Motor Skills <u>Desired Result 4</u> Safety and Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal Care Routines • Personal Safety • Understanding Healthy Lifestyle

For 2005-06, a birth-to-5 version of the DRDP access is being field-tested. Table 7c presents how items/measures within each indicator in this birth-to-five instrument will roll up to the three outcomes.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10**Table 7c.**

Desired Results Developmental Profile access: Birth-to-5 Instrument

Outcome 1: Positive Social Relationships	Outcome 2: Knowledge and Skills	Outcome 3: Action to Meet Needs
<p>Desired Result 1</p> <p>Self Concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity of Self and Connection to Others • Recognition of Ability • Self-Expression <p>Social and Interpersonal Skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empathy • Interactions with Adults • Relationships with Familiar Adults • Interactions with Peers • Friendships • Conflict Negotiation • Awareness of Diversity <p>Self-Regulation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impulse Control • Seeking Other's Help to Regulate Self • Responsiveness to Other's Support • Self-Comforting • Taking Turns 	<p>Desired Result 1</p> <p>Language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Comprehension • Responsiveness to Language • Expresses Self Through Language • Uses Language in Conversation <p>Desired Result 2</p> <p>Learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curiosity and Initiative • Attention Maintenance and Persistence <p>Cognitive Competence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memory • Cause and Effect • Problem Solving • Symbolic and Dramatic Play <p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands Quantity and Counting • Math Operations • Comparison of Quantity • Shapes • Classification and Matching • Measurement • Patterning • Time <p>Literacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in Literacy • Concepts of Print • Letter and Word Knowledge • Phonological Awareness • Emerging Writing • Comprehension of Text 	<p>Desired Result 3</p> <p>Motor Skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movement • Balance • Grasp/Release and Manipulation • Eye-Hand Coordination <p>Desired Result 4</p> <p>Safety and Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toileting and Hygiene • Dressing • Self-Feeding • Personal Safety • Eating and Nutrition

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Data Collected in 2004-05: Data collected for preschool children in special education using DRDP access in Spring 2005 will be used to provide data related to the three OSEP outcomes. The comparative typical sample was observed on DRDP in Spring 2005 (two applicable scales were developed - infant/toddler and preschool). For this 2004-05 data analysis, a new scale that includes all the infant-toddler and preschool items/measures will be created to get item estimates. With this procedure, children's scores can be compared to determine the percentage of children who are at, above, or below age level (status data).

Data collected in 2005-06: Presuming SED can collect data on a minimum of 300 typically developing preschool age children using the birth-to-five instrument within the same time frame as the current study (with a six-month interval between time one and time two), CDE will be able to report on the complete OSEP outcome indicators for a sample of children in the APR for 2005-06 (due in February 2007).

Data collected in 2006-07: CDE will be able to report statewide entry data (three and four year olds) in the 2006-07 APR (due in February 2008)

Data collected in 2007-08: Presuming that the five-year old instrument can be completed, CDE will be able to report baseline entry and exit data for three, four and five year olds in the 2007-08 APR (due in February 2009). CDE will also establish statewide benchmarks and report in the 2007-08 APR.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. However, as indicated in the 2003-04 APR, CDE indicated that it would provide developmental status information for language development, literacy and social emotional development based on 2004-05 assessments. Presented below are developmental status data from the 2004-05 calibration studies organized by outcome area:

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. As indicated above, CDE will provide baseline and target data in the 2007-08 APR.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. CDE will provide baseline and target data in the 2007-08 APR.
2006 (2006-07)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. CDE will provide baseline and target data in the 2007-08 APR.
2007 (2007-08)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. CDE will provide baseline and target data in the 2007-08 APR.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-09)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. CDE will provide baseline and target data in the 2007-08 APR.
2009 (2009-10)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. CDE will provide baseline and target data in the 2007-08 APR.
2010 (2010-11)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided this year. CDE will provide baseline and target data in the 2007-08 APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The CDE has been developing a statewide system of progress assessment for young children since the mid-1990s. This system, the DR includes a set of desired results (standards) and a method for assessing child progress known as DRDP. Children with disabilities have been included in the development of the DR system and DRDP since its inception. Accommodations and adaptations of the regular DRDP have been developed and researched along with the base instrument. In 2001, DR was reconceptualized to provide greater psychometric integrity. The base constructs were researched and revised and a new set of items were developed to conform to the underlying constructs. The indicators and measures have been extensively researched on young children including young children with disabilities. As a part of this research and development efforts, CDE has also initiated the development of preschool learning standards for literacy and mathematics, aligned to the state standards for school age children.

In January 2005, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction announced a major preschool initiative in his State of Education Address. This initiative, the Preschool for all Initiative includes, among other things, a major focus on accountability, which has prompted an additional focus on the development of standards and the implementation of the systems of assessment. It is anticipated that the CDD of CDE will implement the new version of DRDP in the fall of 2006, and will subsequently make adjustments to DRDP. Typically, research on the adaptations to DRDP lag one year behind the basic instrument (as adaptations are made and tested subsequent to the evaluation of the base instrument). In 2004-05, CDE anticipated providing baseline, status data (one data point) from a sample of districts related to the developmental improvement of preschool age children using the prior indicators in APR. However, OSEP has changed the indicators and, as a result, CDE only has one data point and does not yet have the age cutoffs for typically developing children that are needed to respond to the new indicator. Nonetheless, CDE will complete the assessment measures and implement the statewide assessment system as follows:

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Activities	Timelines	Resources
Complete development and field test of Birth to Five instrument	June 2006	CDE staff and contractors
Develop five year old instrument	June 2006	CDE staff and contractors
Field test and calibrate five year old instrument	June 2007	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct Administrator Training	January to April 2006	CDE staff and contractors
Develop training cadres	June and July 2006	CDE staff, contractors and LEA grantees
Conduct Statewide training	September to December 2006	CDE staff, contractors and LEA grantees
Provide ongoing technical assistance and support	September 2006 - ongoing	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct statewide training on 5 year old instrument	September 2007	CDE staff and contractors
Collect entry data on 3 and 4 year olds	Spring 2007	LEAs and SELPAs
Collect entry and exit data on 3,4, and 5 year olds	Fall 2007 and Spring 2008	LEAs and SELPAs
Develop benchmarks and targets	Summer and Fall 2008	CDE staff and contractors
Provide continuous training and technical assistance regarding instruction and accountability	Ongoing	CDE staff and contractors

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #8 - Parent Involvement

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

<p>Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)</p>
--

<p>Indicator - Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)).</p>
--

<p>Measurement: Percent of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Percent is calculated by dividing the number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities multiplied by 100. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)).</p>
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The California Department of Education (CDE) collects parent involvement information in a variety of ways: through monitoring processes (Verification Reviews (VR) and Special Education Self Reviews (SESR)), through the 800 number operated by CDE's Procedural Safeguards and Referral Services (PSRS), and through Family Empowerment Centers (FECs) and Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs). These systems are described below. Per the SPP instructions, the survey instrument is provided in Table 8a.

Verification Reviews (VR): All monitoring reviews require Parent Input Meetings and/or Parent Surveys. For Verification Reviews, CDE contracts with the Sacramento County Office of Education to select and train parents of children with disabilities to act as facilitators at Parent Input meetings. A specific set of parent questions with probes form the core of the Parent Input meeting. These questions are tied to CDE's monitoring questions and are linked to specific compliance items. If parents in a particular district express concerns that are potential violations of state or federal laws and regulations, those issues are included in the monitoring plan and are investigated during the review. These monitoring plan issues are stored in the database for the Verification Review. Also, input cards are available at the meeting for parents to complete. These cards are collected and tabulated for each Parent Input meeting.

Special Education Self Reviews (SESR): Each local educational agency (LEA) is required to conduct a parent input meeting and/or to conduct a survey of all of the parents in the district. A minimum of a 20 percent response is required. CDE specifies the minimum questions that must be addressed in the parent input meeting and provides a survey for use by the district. Like the VR, the SESR requires a monitoring plan. The monitoring plan is reviewed and approved by CDE before the district begins

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

the SESR monitoring activities. Parent input issues are also entered into the SESR software and store in the SESR database.

Procedural Safeguards and Referral Services (PSRS): Provides technical assistance information and resources for parents, school districts, advocates, agencies and others of procedural safeguards regarding students between ages 3 and 21 with disabilities and their educational rights. PSRS receives over 10,000 calls each year. These calls are logged into a database.

Parent Support Organizations: CDE works closely with several types of parent support organizations: Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), Family Empowerment Centers (FECs), and Family Resource Centers (FRCs). The PTIs are parent-directed, non-profit 501(c)(3) organizations funded by the U.S. Department of Education as well as private sources. Authorized by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), PTIs are funded to assist parents to: understand special education laws, rights, and responsibilities; understand their child's disability; provide follow-up support; communicate with special educators; participate in IEP decision making and obtain information about a range of options, programs and services. The Family Empowerment Centers are authorized in the California *Education Code* and provide services focusing on families whose children are from the ages of 3 to 22; serve families of children with all disabilities; and prepare families to partner with professionals in obtaining an appropriate education for children with disabilities. staff of the PTIs and FECs participate in all state-level planning, workgroups and initiatives. CDE regularly solicits information at the state level and often solicits information at the individual district level to verify potential monitoring concerns. The FRCs are funded by the Department of Developmental Services for Early Start parent services. Families of infants and toddlers, birth to 36 months at risk of or with developmental delays and disabilities, receive parent-to-parent support from Early Start Family Resource Centers and Networks.

While CDE collects a great deal of parent information, it is problem-oriented - designed to identify issues and concerns - not oriented to identify district successes with parent involvement.

For 2005-06, CDE will be adding a question to the surveys used in reviews to be able to collect information about the number of parents who report that schools facilitated parent involvement to improve services and results for children with disabilities. The question will be added to the existing surveys and will be assessed using a five point Likert-scale. This method will reach approximately one quarter of the LEAs in the state each year. LEAs will be required to send a survey to all parents in the district. A minimum of a percent response rate will be required. As in previous SESR processes, these data will be incorporated into the monitoring plans and the SESR database.

For 2006-07, CDE will work with the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM), parent organizations in California, and state and local district personnel to incorporate appropriate elements of the Part B Parent/Family Involvement measures into the SESR surveys in order to add to the existing, problem-oriented data. This work will be conducted in 2005-06 for utilization in 2006-07.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10**Table 8a**

California's Parent Survey, 2004-05
(Available in English and Spanish)

1	What special education service(s) does your child get: (Please circle all that apply)	Speech	Adaptive PE	Resource	Special Day Class	Other	
2	Were the reasons for your child being placed into Special Education explained to you so that you understood?				Y	N	Don't Know
3	Do you participate in an Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting at least once a year?				Y	N	Don't Know
4	If your child is a baby to three years of age, is your child's Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) gone over with you at least every six months?				Y	N	Don't Know
5	Did a regular education teacher participate in your child's IEP meeting?				Y	N	Don't Know
6	Was the information you provided about your child included when planning and writing his or her IEP?				Y	N	Don't Know
7	Were your concerns about your child talked about and put into the IEP?				Y	N	Don't Know
8	If your child is age 14 years or older, did the IEP team discuss transition services (e.g., career interests, employment, high school classes) during the IEP meeting?				Y	N	Don't Know
9	At your child's IEP meeting, did the team discuss your child's services in terms of it being in the least restrictive environment (e.g., general education classroom, resource, special day class)?				Y	N	Don't Know
10	Are your child's teacher(s) aware of his or her learning needs?				Y	N	Don't Know
11	Does the school district provide the support that your child needs to learn and progress in school, as it is written in the IEP?				Y	N	Don't Know
12	Does your child participate in all school activities (e.g., assemblies, after school activities and field trips)?				Y	N	Don't Know
13	At your child's IEP meeting, did the IEP team talk about how your child would participate in state and district testing?				Y	N	Don't Know
14	Is your child making progress in school: is he or she making progress as written in his or her IEP goals or IFSP outcomes?				Y	N	Don't Know
15	Do you get routine reports on how he or she is meeting their IEP goals or IFSP outcomes?				Y	N	Don't Know
16	Is your child getting the number and amount of services that are listed on his or her IEP or IFSP (e.g., speech two times a week for 30 minutes)?				Y	N	Don't Know
17	Did you receive a copy of your parental rights (procedural safeguards) and did someone offer to explain your rights to you?				Y	N	Don't Know

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

If you don't speak English at home, is your child learning English at school? If yes, answer questions 18-22				
18	Does your child's IEP talk about your child's need to learn English?	Y	N	Don't Know
19	As an English learner, does your child receive support to progress in speaking English?	Y	N	Don't Know
20	Is your child getting the support in special education classes that he or she needs to learn other subjects like math or science?	Y	N	Don't Know
21	If you speak a language other than English, do you get information from the school in your language?	Y	N	Don't Know
22	At your child's IEP meeting, do they interpret all of the information you need to know about your child in your language?	Y	N	Don't Know

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

As a new SPP indicator, baseline and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2006 (2006-07)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2007 (2007-08)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2008 (2008-09)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2009 (2009-10)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2010 (2010-11)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Future Development		
Add survey question to parent input surveys for Special Education Self Reviews, Verification Reviews, and Nonpublic School Reviews	January 2006	CDE staff and contractors
Meet with National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and parent organizations (Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs) and Family Empowerment Centers (FECs)) to develop instrument for use in 2006-07	June 2007	CDE staff, NCSEAM, contractors, PTIs, and FEC's
Incorporate updated family survey into all monitoring processes.	September 2007	CDE staff and contractors
Monitoring and Stakeholder Meetings		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS).	Ongoing	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports.	July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2011	CDE staff
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment, Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), and the IEP Task Force.	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, and CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #9 - Disproportionality Overall

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
Indicator - Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))
Measurement: Percent = number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by number of districts in the State times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

California's Quality Assurance Process (QAP) is a statewide special education district-level review that focuses on both compliance and educational benefit. The QAP process allows review of all local educational agencies (LEA) in California through its four balanced components: 1) Local Plan, 2) Special Education Self Review (SESR), 3) Complaints Management, and 4) Focused Monitoring. All monitoring processes require review of multiple data sources for development of a monitoring plan. The Special Education Division (SED) uses data specific to disproportionality (and other performance data) when monitoring districts. In previous years, when a district was undergoing a review, and its disproportionality measure was both above the annual benchmark and above the disproportionality for the previous year, it was required to review all policies and practices to determine if assessment and placement decisions were race neutral.

When it was determined that the LEA had policies or practices that lead to inappropriate assessment or placement decisions, the LEA was required to describe the changes it intended to make and provide evidence of having done so. If an LEA found that a disparity continued to exist even when following good practices, it must describe the circumstances to the state. The state will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs in this area and impose sanctions if an LEA refuses to make necessary changes. As part of the QAP, CDE will continue this process during future reviews.

For each district, California calculates a race-neutral measure labeled the Disparity Index as part of the QAP. Specifically, the number of K-12 students in special education within each ethnic category is divided by the total number of all K-12 students in that category. The index is simply the range between the lowest and the highest group percentages. The underlying concept is that if the identification process is race neutral, the disparity index will be relatively low. The state has set a system of decreasing annual benchmarks leading to a maximum disparity of 5 points by 2011-12.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

In future years, California will combine the disparity measure with a composition index in a race neutral approach to identifying which districts are disproportionate. The first test is to identify those districts that have a disparity that is higher than the annual benchmark. The second test, based on the composition index, looks at the proportion of each ethnic enrollment in special education in a district. For each ethnic category, this proportion is compared to the proportion of that group in the entire kindergarten through 12th grade (K-12) population of the district. When the proportion receiving special education for any ethnic category is more than 20 percent higher than its proportion in K-12 AND the district has higher disparity using the disparity test, the district is identified as disproportionate.

The mere fact that enrollment data identify a district as disproportionate does not reveal if the disproportionality is related to inappropriate identification. In a state the size of California, it is not feasible to examine each and every record of individual students in a particular group to determine if an appropriate identification decision has been reached for each child. By examining the relative proportions within LEAs, the state can make rational decisions about where to focus its efforts to achieve results for all children. California will focus its efforts on the districts identified as disproportionate through the QAP.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2006 (2006-07)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2007 (2007-08)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2008 (2008-09)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2009 (2009-10)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2010 (2010-11)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

All monitoring processes require review of multiple data sources for development of a monitoring plan. The SED will continue using data specific to disproportionality (and other performance data) when monitoring districts. When disproportion is evident, policies and practices and procedures will be reviewed and revised by the LEA and approved by the CDE. All districts with disproportionate representation will receive a California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) non-compliance notification.

Districts undergoing a QAP review will address the issue of disproportion during the review process. Districts not undergoing a formal review will be required to respond in writing to CDE outlining the results of their review of policies and practices. Where policies or practices are found to lead to misidentification, the district must demonstrate how those policies or practices have been changed, staff have been notified, and new policies/practices were implemented.

California will participate in national discussions about disproportionality and attend conferences and other meetings related to this issue. SED will request technical assistance and/or support from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt), the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC), and other technical assistance providers when appropriate.

The SED will continue analyze CASEMIS data and collaborate with colleagues to foster a greater understanding of the issue and strategies to effectively teach all students. During the 2006-07 school year, California will survey LEAs in order to identify promising practices for reducing disproportionality and increasing student achievement.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #10 - Disproportionality Disability

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
Indicator - Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))
Measurement: Percent = number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by number of districts in the State times 100

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

California's Quality Assurance Process (QAP) is a statewide special education district-level review that focuses on both compliance and educational benefit. The QAP process allows review of all local educational agencies (LEA) in California through its four balanced components: 1) Local Plan, 2) Special Education Self Review (SESR), 3) Complaints Management, and 4) Focused Monitoring. All monitoring processes require review of multiple data sources for development of a monitoring plan. The Special Education Division (SED) uses data specific to disproportionality (and other performance data) when monitoring districts. In previous years, when a district was undergoing a review, and its disproportionality measure was both above the annual benchmark and above the disproportionality for the previous year, it was required to review all policies and practices to determine if assessment and placement decisions were race neutral. When it was determined that the LEA had policies or practices that lead to inappropriate assessment or placement decisions, the LEA was required to describe the changes it intended to make and provide evidence of having done so. If an LEA found that a disparity continued to exist even when following good practices, it must describe the circumstances to the state. The state will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs in this area and impose sanctions if an LEA refuses to make necessary changes. As part of the QAP, CDE will continue this process during future reviews.

When aggregated into ethnic by disability categories, the cell numbers for most districts become too small for meaningful analyses. The figures can, however, be useful in helping LEAs and the state focus on specific identification practices for individual groups. To that end, in 2007 the state will make available district-level composition indices and will require LEAs identified as disproportionate to show how they used this information to modify policies and procedures when that is required. In addition, California will use these data as part of the ongoing education and technical assistance provided in the area of disproportionality.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

In future years, California will calculate composition indices for each of thirty cells based on the distributions of students in five ethnic categories and six disability categories. Students in the following six disability categories will be included: mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. Using enrollment data from 2005-06 and 2006-07, the state will set a threshold for disproportionality based on the number of cells in which the percentage of students is more than 20 percent above what would be expected based on the percent of that ethnic group among the population of students receiving special education or services.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007. These baseline data must reflect the 2005-06 school year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The mere fact that enrollment data identify a district as disproportionate does not reveal if the disproportionality is related to inappropriate identification. In a state the size of California, it is not feasible to examine all individual students in a particular group to determine if an appropriate identification decision has been reached for each child. By examining the relative proportions within LEAs, the state can make some rational decisions about where to focus its efforts to achieve results for all children. California will focus its efforts on the districts identified as disproportionate.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2006 (2006-07)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2007 (2007-08)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2008 (2008-09)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2009 (2009-10)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2010 (2010-11)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Analyses of statewide data confirm that African American students in California have a much higher risk of being found eligible for special education and are then more likely to be educated in more restrictive settings than are students in other ethnic categories.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

The established LEA policies and procedures for eligibility identification and educational environment assignment do not overtly prescribe race-based decisions about students. The state recognizes that factors contributing to disproportionality are not mitigated merely by establishing race neutral policies and is engaged in educating the educators about the disproportionality issues and finding ways to ensure that all of the children who are entitled to special education will receive it. California is working to ensure that students who need assistance prior to an eligibility determination will receive help through the regular education system. The state supports and encourages training for staff in using data to help in discovering practices that lead to misidentifying students. California also provides technical assistance in early intervention strategies.

All monitoring processes require review of multiple data sources for development of a monitoring plan. The SED will continue using data specific to disproportionality (and other performance data) when monitoring districts. California will participate in national discussions about disproportionality and attend conferences and other meetings related to this issue. SED will request technical assistance and/or support from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt), the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC), and other technical assistance providers when appropriate.

During 2005-06, CDE will develop methods and criteria for identifying when disproportion is related to inappropriate identification in ways that respect the integrity of Individualized Education Program (IEP) team decisions.

California will continue to participate in national discussions about disproportionality and attend conferences and other meetings related to this issue. SED will requests technical assistance and/or support from National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt), the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC), and other technical assistance providers when appropriate.

The SED will continue to encourage analyses of CASEMIS data and collaboration with colleagues to foster a greater understanding of the issue and strategies to effectively teach all students in the least restrictive environment. During the 2006-07 school year, California will continue with a survey of LEAs in order to identify promising practices for reducing disproportionality and increasing student achievement.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #11 - Eligibility Evaluation

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/ Child Find
Indicator - Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))
Measurement: A. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received. B. Number of children (for whom parental consent to evaluate was received) determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days. C. Number of children (for whom parental consent to evaluate was received) determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Local educational agencies (LEA) in California have a legal responsibility to conduct evaluations within 60-days beginning in the 2005-06 school year. Previously, California's timeline was 45-days. Bi-annual California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) training sessions address this issue as well as monitoring.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data do not need to be provided until the FFY 2005 Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

During the 2004-05 school year, the Special Education Division (SED) continued critical work with the Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC) and LEAs to capture additional data to assist the state and LEAs with program improvement and monitoring for students with disabilities. As a result, there are currently proposed changes to the 2006-07 CASEMIS, the individual student-level data collection for students with disabilities, to capture new data elements required under SPP, APR, and Section 618 of the reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA).

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Beginning in 2006-07, these data elements will be included in CASEMIS. The 2006-07 school year will be the first year these data are collected through CASEMIS and it is imperative to recognize that reliable data may not be available until at least two years after this initial data collection year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days for 100 percent of children for who parental consent to evaluate was received.
2006 (2006-07)	Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days for 100 percent of children for who parental consent to evaluate was received.
2007 (2007-08)	Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days for 100 percent of children for who parental consent to evaluate was received.
2008 (2008-09)	Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days 100 percent of children for who parental consent to evaluate was received.
2009 (2009-10)	Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days for 100 percent of children for who parental consent to evaluate was received.
2010 (2010-11)	Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days for 100 percent of children for who parental consent to evaluate was received.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

This indicator will be monitored at part of the focused monitoring process.

Future activities include addressing the child find requirements in bi-annual CASEMIS training sessions with SELPAs and LEAs. This will improve the reliability and accuracy of data reported to CDE and will draw the attention of the LEAs to focus on their legal responsibility to conduct evaluations within 60 days. The CDE and SELPA staffs jointly determine the content and scope of these bi-annual training sessions.

This new data requirement requires extensive modification to existing data management systems at the state and local levels. During the 2005-06 school year CDE staff will work to modify the CASEMIS software. The CDE staff will provide extensive training, software support, and ongoing technical assistance to SELPAs and LEAs during the transition to the new CASEMIS collection.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs.	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Finalize new child find data fields for CASEMIS	Fall 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Modify CASEMIS data table structure to incorporate new data fields and update table codes	Fall 2005	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Modify validation codes and develop prototype reports	Spring 2006	CDE staff
Beta-test new CASEMIS software	Summer 2006	CDE staff
Official deployment of CASEMIS software	October 2006	CDE staff
Provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure reliable and accurate submission of data	Ongoing throughout the year	CDE staff
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs.	Each year in the Fall and sometimes Spring	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Monitoring and Stakeholder Meetings		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	Ongoing	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports.	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2011	CDE staff
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment, Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), and the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Task Force	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, and CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #12 - Part C to Part B Transition

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition
Indicator - Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
Measurement: A. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. B. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. C. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Account for children included in A, but not included in B or C. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays. Percent = C divided by A - B times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

It is the policy of the State of California that each local educational agency (LEA), special education local plan area (SELPA), or county office of education (COE) shall ensure that each child participating in early childhood special education services pursuant to this chapter, and who will participate in preschool programs under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), experiences a smooth and effective transition to those preschool programs [30 *Education Code* (EC) 56426.9(a)]. California laws and regulations are very clear about processes to support transition of children and families from services under IDEA Part C to services under Part B of IDEA (17 CCR 52112). Beginning at two years, six months, the family's service coordinator is responsible for contacting both the family and LEA to notify them of the need to conduct an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting to plan for transition of the child to services under Part B. This IFSP meeting must be held before the child is two years, nine months of age and may be conducted as early as six months before the child's third birthday. LEA representatives are required to participate in transition planning meetings. The transition matters to be discussed, to be recorded in the IFSP, and to be carried out are specified in regulation. California law is also clear that "by the third birthday of a child... [who may be eligible for services under Part B of IDEA], [the LEA shall] ensure that an individualized education program ... has been developed and is being implemented for the child consistent with a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for children beginning at three years of age" (30 EC 56426.9(b)). The State of California provides funds for parent-to-parent support, including transition assistance through the Family Resource Centers (IDEA Part C) and Family Empowerment Centers (IDEA Part B).

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Data for this indicator are collected by two different agencies in the State of California. Information regarding children served under IDEA Part C is collected by the Department of Developmental Services (DDS), which is the lead agency for IDEA Part C. Data regarding children served in IDEA Part B is maintained by the California Department of Education (CDE) through the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). The exchange of child find information with IDEA Part C was a major break through in the ability of both agencies to assess the effectiveness of transition to IDEA Part B. This was facilitated by the federal Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to CDE's Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2002-03. Both CDE and DDS are committed to work together to improve coordination and facilitate service delivery to young children with disabilities and their families. There are difficulties in interpreting the data from IDEA Part C: 1) names do not always match across systems; 2) the data provided does not include a referral date to IDEA Part B; and 3) without a clear indication of who was referred, DDS and CDE must use other means to determine might be potentially eligible for IDEA Part B. The most recent data available from IDEA Part C are data from 2003-04. An initial assumption was that a data set of children served in IDEA Part C who were identified as having a developmental disability, combined with information in CASEMIS about infants and toddlers who are blind, deaf, deaf blind, and orthopedically impaired in IDEA Part C, would be the best estimate of who would be potentially eligible for IDEA Part B. Initial matching of the complete data sets indicated that a significant number of matches beyond those children identified as having a developmental disability. As a result, data reported in Tables 12a and 12b include all young children in both IDEA Part C and IDEA Part B data sets. DDS has indicated that they are adding a referral date to IDEA Part B data element in the 2005-06 program year. CASEMIS is adding a referral date element in 2006-07. This will improve data collection for 2005-06 and 2006-07.

Level at which local data will be reported: There are approximately 1,100 LEAs in the state of California. They vary in size from one-room schoolhouses to very large districts in cities like Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego. CDE's experience with calculating Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is that there are many districts with such a small population that the calculation of a percentage is meaningless. This is even more difficult when calculating percentages for preschool age children, as they are so much less populous than the group of students who are 6-21 years of age. In addition, not every program serves the same population of students. Within the special education local planning area (SELPA) structure, one district may serve all of the severely involved students, another may serve blind students, and a third may serve students with autism. Comparing districts that serve different populations is not very useful. As a result, CDE is planning to calculate and report outcome data at the SELPA level, as SELPAs are of sufficient size to generate a meaningful statistic and SELPA to SELPA comparisons are more meaningful to the overall preschool population.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10
Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

Table 12a depicts the number and percent of children served in Part C who turned 3 years of age in 2003-04 and who entered Part B before their 3rd birthday.

Table 12a
 Part C to Part B Transition in California, 2003-04

Part C Population (turn three in 2003-04)	Total Number in Part C Data Set	Match with CASEMIS (June 2004)	Entered Part B Before Third Birthday	Percent Entered Before Third Birthday
Developmentally Disabled	2,076	1,886	1,281	67.92
All Others	10,691	4,513	3,000	66.47
Total	12,767	6,399	4,281	66.90

The following table depicts the range in days beyond the third birthday when children served in IDEA Part C entered IDEA Part B.

Of the data required for the calculation as described above, there is insufficient data available to make the required calculations. The chart below depicts when data will become available.

Table 12c
 California's Plan to Obtain Part C to B IDEA Transition Data

Required Data	Number served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	Number referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays	Number found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays
Data Availability	Information available in 2005-06 from DDS	Information available in 2006-07 in CASEMIS	Currently available for 2003-04 through data table match.	Calculation will be possible for 2006-07

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data presented does not have the precision needed to fulfill the requirements as outlined in the SPP indicators. First, there is no information from Part C about which of the children were referred to Part B. Second, there is no information about which children were referred, assessed, and found not eligible by their third birthday. Sixty-six percent of the three-year olds in the IDEA Part C database entered IDEA Part B by their

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

third birthday. After 90 days, the percentage increased to 97 percent of those matched between the databases.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	100 percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2006 (2006-07)	100 percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays
2007 (2007-08)	100 percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays
2008 (2008-09)	100 percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays
2009 (2009-10)	100 percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays
2010 (2010-11)	100 percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following improvement activities describe CDE's commitment to review and monitor all referrals from IDEA Part C to IDEA Part B. The CDE staff will meet with DDS staff to review IDEA Part C to IDEA Part B referrals by regional center and by LEA to identify issues for monitoring and follow-up. Not only will the agencies send out renewed information about transition requirements, but will develop and implement corrective plans for LEAs who fail to participate in transition activities and implement IEPs by the child's third birthday.

Activity	Timeline	Resources
Meet with Part C staff to review data by Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA), LEA and Regional Center.	By January 1, 2006	Part B and C staff
Prepare general mailing regarding the status, policies and procedures and resources available related to transition.	By January 1, 2006	Part B and C staff and resources
Explore development of a joint letter to SELPAs, LEAs, and/or Regional Center where rates are low.	By January 1, 2006	Part B and C staff and resources

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Activity	Timeline	Resources
Conduct follow-up teleconferences and/or site visits to assess compliance and provide technical assistance.	By April 1, 2006	Part B and C staff and resources
Prepare and follow-up on corrective action plans as required	By June 30, 2006	Part B and C staff and resources
Meet annually to plan for monitoring and technical assistance activities related to transition from Part C to Part B, based on Annual Performance Report data.	2006 - 07 through 2010-11	Part B and C staff and resources
Monitoring and Stakeholder Meetings		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	October 2005 - June 30, 2010	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports.	July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2011	CDE staff
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment, Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC), and the IEP Task Force	Semi-annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, and CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #13 - Secondary Transition Goals and Services

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective Supervision Part B/Effective Transition

Indicator - Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Number of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by the number of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Secondary transition has been a goal under the Quality Assurance Process (QAP). In addition, the state is focused on this issue through an Interagency Transition Stakeholders Group (Community of Practice) that was launched during the 2004-05 school year in collaboration with the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). The Community of Practice (CoP) will periodically convene over the next six years to identify barriers, solutions, and untapped resources and to collect data demonstrating what works and how to replicate successful strategies. Multiple agencies such as the Department of Rehabilitation Services (DRS), Department of Social Services (DSS), and the Employment Development Department (EDD) may be involved with this interagency work. One barrier to this type of work, specifically sharing student-level data across agencies, has been the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

95.7 percent of students age 15 or above were reported as having transition services language in their IEPs.

As stated in the 2003-04 Annual Performance Report (APR), CDE has been working to capture additional data about secondary transition services and the baseline data reported here represent the first year of data collection for this variable. The measure for this indicator will change beginning with the 2006-07 school year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

During the 2003-04 school year the Special Education Division (SED) worked with the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Stakeholder Advisory group and local educational agencies (LEA) to modify the primary data collection, the California Special Education

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Management System (CASEMIS) for students with disabilities in the state, to capture additional secondary transition data. The 2004-05 school year represents the first year these data were collected and it is imperative to recognize that reliable data may not be available until at least two years after this initial data collection year. The 2004-05 baseline data provided in this document indicate the percent of students aged 15 or above with transition services language in the IEP. The 2005-06 data will report on the same data field but for students 16 or older, consistent with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 (IDEA).

During the 2004-05 school year, SED continued critical work with the KPI Stakeholder Advisory Committee and LEAs to capture additional data specific to secondary transition. As a result, there are currently proposals for the 2006-07 school year to modify existing data fields to capture specific secondary transition goals identified in statute (614 (d)(1)(A)(i)(VIII)(aa)) as well as secondary transition services.

These new data elements will assist the state and LEAs with program improvement and monitoring.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	One hundred percent of students age 16 or above will have transition services language in the IEP.
2006 (2006-07)	One hundred percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP will have annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.
2007 (2007-08)	One hundred percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP will have annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.
2008 (2008-09)	One hundred percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP will have annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.
2009 (2009-10)	One hundred percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP will have annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.
2010 (2010-11)	One hundred percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP will have annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Future activities include establishing a Transition List Service (in 2005-06) and a Web page with links and resources and a Clearinghouse to share information. The CoP was launched during the 2004-05 school year in collaboration with the NASDSE. The CoP will periodically convene over the next six years to identify barriers, solutions, and untapped resources and to collect data demonstrating what works and how to replicate successful strategies. Multiple agencies such as DRS, DSS, and EDD may be involved

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

with this interagency work. One barrier to this type of work, specifically sharing student-level data across agencies has been FERPA. This work will continue through the SPP cycle.

As one part of coordinated secondary transition efforts, the data collection process from the State's model WorkAbility Program will be merged into CASEMIS. It is proposed that this phase-in begins during the 2006-07 school year. In addition, CDE will continue to work with the State WorkAbility Advisory Committee to develop programs and secondary transition services to assist students with disabilities in their preparation for the workforce and living independently. CDE staff will continue to meet with other agencies such as the DRS and EDD to develop an interagency transition evaluation model. These interagency efforts will continue through the cycle of the SPP. As mentioned before, one barrier to this type of work has been the FERPA.

In May 2005, the California State Board of Education adopted Career-Technical Education standards and a model curriculum framework that incorporates the input of various post-secondary stakeholder groups with elements of transition services for all students including those with disabilities.

This new data requirement requires extensive modification to existing data management systems at the state and local levels. During the 2005-06 school year CDE staff will work to modify the CASEMIS software. CDE staff will provide extensive training, software support, and ongoing technical assistance to SELPAs and LEAs during the transition to the new CASEMIS collection.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Finalize secondary transition data fields for CASEMIS	Fall 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Modify CASEMIS data table structure to incorporate new data fields and update table codes	Fall 2005	CDE staff
Modify validation codes and develop prototype reports	Spring 2005	CDE staff
Beta-test new CASEMIS software	Summer 2006	CDE staff
Official deployment of CASEMIS software	October 2006	CDE staff
Provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure reliable and accurate submission of data	Ongoing throughout the year	CDE staff
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs.	Each year in the Fall and sometimes Spring	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	October 2005 to June 30, 2010	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports.	July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2011	CDE staff
Follow up CASEMIS letter related to transition service language data.	December 30, 2005	CDE staff
Provide regionalized training and technical assistance regarding transition services language in the IEP.	October, November 2005; March, April, May and June 2006	CDE staff, Workability I staff
Utilize transition data in the Workability I grant procedures to ensure programs include the provision of transition services.	December 30, 2005	CDE staff
Utilize transition data for the Workability I reapplication funding process.	December 30, 2005	CDE staff
Utilize statewide community of practice for collaborative efforts related to transition services across multiple agencies (DOR, EDD, SILC, parents and consumers).	June 30, 2006	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #14 - Post-school

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective Supervision Part B/Effective Transition
Indicator - Percent of youth who had Individualized Education Programs (IEP), are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))
Measurement: Percent = number of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by number of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

California's model WorkAbility Program has been the primary source for post-school data for students with disabilities. This State Performance Plan indicator requires that post-school information be collected for all students who received special education services. During the summer months of 2005, the Special Education Division (SED) worked with special education local plan areas (SELPA) and local educational agencies (LEA) to determine strategies to meet this data requirement. As a result, the 2006-07 CASEMIS data fields have been modified to capture the required post-school activities in statute (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)). One barrier to this type of work, specifically sharing student-level data across agencies has been the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007. These baseline data must reflect the 2005-06 school year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the Annual Performance Report (APR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007. These baseline data must reflect the 2005-06 school year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-07)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2007 (2007-08)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2008 (2008-09)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2009 (2009-10)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2010 (2010-11)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided until the APR that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

California currently does not collect post-school outcome data for all students who received special education services. As one part of coordinated secondary transition efforts, the data collection process from the State's model WorkAbility Program will be merged into California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). It is proposed that this phase-in begins during the 2006-07 school year. In addition, the California Department of Education (CDE) will continue to work with the State WorkAbility Advisory Committee to develop programs and secondary transition services to assist students with disabilities in their preparation for the workforce and living independently. CDE staff will continue to meet with other agencies such as DRS and EDD to develop an interagency transition evaluation model. These interagency efforts will continue through the cycle of the SPP. As mentioned before, one barrier to this type of work has been the FERPA.

This new data collection burden requires that CDE modify the existing data collection system for students with disabilities beyond school. During the 2006-07 school year CASEMIS will include data fields to address this new indicator. LEA's will report these data to CDE through CASEMIS yearly on students who left high school the previous school year. Each Leas will determine the method of data collection (for example, who collects the data: for example - special education teacher, LEA staff, university, contractor, etc.). These data will be used for SPP and APR reporting purposes. Targets will be set during the 2005-06 meetings of the Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee (KPISC). The bi-annual CASEMIS training sessions with SELPAs and LEAs will focus on this SPP indicator. During these training sessions CDE will address strategies to increase response rates. Paid employment will constitute competitive employment. During the 2005-06 school year CDE will work with LEAs and SELPAs to modify exiting data systems and train program staff to maximize the likelihood that reliable and accurate data are reported to CDE.

This new data requirement requires extensive modification to existing data management systems at the state and local levels. During the 2005-06 school year CDE staff will work to modify the CASEMIS software. CDE staff will provide extensive training,

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

software support, and ongoing technical assistance to SELPAs and LEAs during the transition to the new CASEMIS collection.

Improvement activities	Timelines	Resources
Finalize new post school follow-up data fields for CASEMIS	Fall 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Modify CASEMIS data table structure to incorporate new data fields and update table codes	Fall 2005	CDE staff
Modify validation codes and develop prototype reports	Spring 2005	CDE staff
Beta-test new CASEMIS software	Summer 2006	CDE staff
Establish benchmarks and target with statewide Key Performance Indicator Stakeholder Committee	March 2006 November 2006	CDE staff, parents, advocates, professional organizations and administrator groups
Official deployment of CASEMIS software	October 2006	CDE staff
Provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure reliable and accurate submission of data	Ongoing throughout the year	CDE staff
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs	Each year in the Fall and sometimes Spring	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Monitoring, Stakeholder Meetings, and Selected Special Projects		
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance, CDE staff
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with CDE Program Improvement and Interventions Office to infuse special education indicators into the Academic Performance Survey (APS) and District Assistance Survey (DAS)	Ongoing	CDE staff and contractors
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for APRs	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2011	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement activities	Timelines	Resources
Convene Stakeholder Groups including the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), KPISC, and the IEP Task Force	Semi annually or more frequent when needed	Representatives including administrative, and/or professional organizations, Parent Training Information Center (PTI), parent leader representatives, and CDE staff
Follow up CASEMIS letter related to transition service language data	December 30, 2005	CDE staff
Provide regionalized training and technical assistance regarding transition services language in the IEP	October, November 2005; March, April, May June 2006	CDE staff, Workability I staff
The Workability I grant procedures utilize transition data to ensure programs include the provision of transition services	December 30, 2005	CDE staff
Utilize transition data for the Workability I reapplication funding process.	November 30, 2005	CDE staff
Utilize statewide community of practice for collaborative efforts related to transition services (DOR, EDD, SILC, parents and consumers)	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #15 - General Supervision

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision
Indicator - General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B)).
<p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators. b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. <p>Percent = b divided by a times 100. For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken</p> <p>B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas. b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. <p>Percent = b divided by a times 100. For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.</p> <p>C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms. b. Number of findings of noncompliance made. c. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. <p>Percent = c divided by b times 100. For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.</p>

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A. Monitoring Processes

The California Department of Education (CDE) is responsible for ensuring that all children with disabilities, ages 3-21, receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) in accordance with the Individuals with

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). To do this, the CDE administers state and federal funds; provides technical assistance; and monitors school districts, county offices of education (COE), special education local plan areas (SELPA) and other public education agencies.

Quality Assurance Process: Since 1999, the Special Education Division (SED) has used multiple methods to carry out its monitoring responsibilities. These monitoring activities are part of an overall Quality Assurance Process (QAP) designed to ensure that procedural guarantees of the law are followed and that programs and services result in educational benefits.

Special Education Goals and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): Under IDEA, the CDE is responsible for establishing statewide goals and indicators to be used to measure progress toward those goals. To do this the CDE convened a comprehensive stakeholder group of parents, advocates, special education staff, professional organizations, and administrator groups. This KPI Stakeholder Group established and maintains the system of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). CDE has developed measures for most of the KPIs using data collected through the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) and other CDE data related to general education. These measures include such things as the percentage of students who are served in special education, ethnic disproportionality in special education, the percent of time that students are served outside of a regular classroom, graduation and dropout rates, and the percentage of students receiving special education services who score proficient or above on statewide tests of academic achievement.

The KPI measures are calculated annually at the district level and published on the CDE Web site. The measures are benchmarked, which allows for comparison of scores to a statewide expectation; for capturing the direction of change; and for comparing districts of similar type (elementary, high school, and unified). These KPIs are used in several ways. First, they are used to select districts for monitoring reviews. Both the Facilitated Review process and the Verification Review process use KPIs to identify the pool of possible districts. Second, the KPIs are used in all monitoring reviews to “focus” review activities on those areas in which the district is below the benchmark expectation and has a KPI value lower than the prior year.

Types of Monitoring Reviews: It is important to recognize that CDE uses all of its QAP activities to monitor for procedural compliance and educational benefit. Some are general activities, such as data collection, investigating compliance complaints, and reviewing local plans, that are used to monitor trends and issues. Annual and periodic analysis of the information obtained through these activities is used to identify potential noncompliance and to require correction. For example, CDE uses CASEMIS data to identify districts that are not completing annual reviews of individualized educational programs (IEPs) in a timely way. Periodic review of the number of complaints to a district may prompt a special visit or review. Other monitoring activities are more formalized and result in monitoring reports, corrective action plans, and follow-up monitoring visits. There are four types of these more formal reviews:

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

1. **Facilitated District Reviews.** These are three-year reviews of districts with the lowest overall KPIs. These reviews begin with a Verification Review to address procedural noncompliance and proceed with site- and district-based intervention to improve student outcomes and LRE.
2. **Verification Reviews (VR).** These are conducted annually for districts whose KPIs are lowest in the selection priorities established by the KPI Stakeholder Group. For the past several years these selection priorities have focused on Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) testing outcomes for students with disabilities and the percent of students served outside of the regular class less than 20 percent or more than 80 percent of the time. The VR is based on a monitoring plan that is developed from parent input meetings, KPI data, and compliance history information. The four primary review activities are: student record reviews (focusing on procedural compliance, educational benefit, and Individualized Education Program (IEP) implementation); policy and procedure reviews; interviews; and a SELPA governance review. Each VR is customized based on its monitoring plan through the use of CDE-developed monitoring software that generates customized review protocols, compliance reports, and corrective action plans. CDE staff in partnership with district staff conducts VRs.
3. **Special Education Self Reviews (SESR).** Roughly a quarter of the districts are required to conduct SESRs each year. Coordinated through the SELPA of which the district is a part, SESR is conducted primarily by district staff using CDE-furnished software and directions. As is done for VR, each district prepares a monitoring plan based on parent input, KPI data, and its compliance history. The monitoring plan is submitted to CDE for review and approval before the actual review begins. CDE has provided SESR software that produces customized forms, compliance reports, and corrective action plans. Again, like the VR, SESR consists of multiple types of record reviews, a review of policies and procedures, and a SELPA governance review. Each district submits the data from their software, through the SELPA to CDE for review evaluation and follow-up.
4. **Nonpublic School and Agency reviews.** Nonpublic schools and agencies are included in the QAP through various stages of monitoring and evaluation activities. Three of these activities include: (1) self review; (2) on-site review; and (3) follow-up review.
 - a. **Self-Review:** The nonpublic school self review (NPSSR) is one of the several critical components in the QAP. Approximately a third of the certified nonpublic schools are selected for a review each year. This is a new activity required by a recent change in California state law (AB 1858, Statutes of 2004). A standard review instrument is accompanied by a parent survey that is sent to the nonpublic schools participating in the NPSSR. The nonpublic school principal or designee and the local educational agency (LEA) collaborate in completing the document. Nonpublic schools have 45 days to complete the report and return it to CDE.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

- b. **On-Site Review:** As required by California state law, on-site reviews are to be conducted once every three years or more frequently if necessary. Nonpublic schools are divided into three sectors in determining the cycle in which the reviews will occur. The degree to which the CDE conducts follow-up reviews is dependent on areas in which the nonpublic school is found in compliance. The CDE involvement does not end until the nonpublic school is fully compliant or when the nonpublic school loses its certification status. Schools scheduled for an on-site review are invited to a training session at the beginning of each school year. Each school receives the evaluation instrument used to conduct the review and is navigated through the process by CDE staff. In addition to administering the evaluation instrument measuring the degree of compliance with state and federal statutes and regulations, an “education benefit” review is included during the visit. The on-site review begins with an entrance meeting, a review of documentation, and observations of teaching and learning with an emphasis on the implementation of each student’s IEP and access to the same standards-base core curriculum used by the school district in which the nonpublic school is located. On conclusion of the review, the monitoring team holds an exit interview with school staff at which time findings are made and plans to remedy any issues of noncompliance are developed. Within 60 days of the review, a written report is issued to the nonpublic school and the contracting local educational agency (LEA). Any LEA items of noncompliance are forwarded to the respective Focused Monitoring and Technical Assistance (FMTA) unit with geographical responsibility that includes LEAs that have students attending the nonpublic school.
 - c. **Follow-up Reviews:** CDE monitors the plan to ensure that progress is being made to correct areas of deficiency. This step may include additional follow-up visits to the nonpublic school. CDE staff also provides technical assistance to the nonpublic school and the LEA in this regard.
5. **Findings, Corrective Action Plans and Follow-up:** Each of the formal review processes results in findings of noncompliance at the student and district level. All findings require correction. At the student level the district must provide specified evidence of correction within a 45-day time period. At the district level, the district must provide updated policies and procedures, evidence that the new policies and procedures have been disseminated and, in a six-month follow-up review, the district must demonstrate that no new instances of noncompliance in that area have occurred. CDE has a variety of sanctions available to use in situations in which noncompliance goes uncorrected: for example, special grant conditions, withholding of funds, and court action.

B. Noncompliance Not Included in Monitoring Plan Areas

The California Department of Education takes a very broad view of the monitoring priority areas. Monitoring software has a comprehensive item table to be drawn for each review. We do not monitor areas not included in the monitoring priorities. As a result, we have not found noncompliance outside of the monitoring priorities.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

C. Complaints, Due Process and Mediation

Noncompliance may be identified as a result of a complaint investigation. These findings are recorded in a complaints tracking database. CDE staff in each of the FMTA units track the correction of individual findings of noncompliance for each complaint. When sufficient evidence of correction is provided for all of the corrective actions, the complaint is closed and a closure letter is sent to both the district and the complainant(s). A third party contractor conducts due process hearings and mediations. Due process hearings and mediations result in compliance agreements. Allegation of a failure to implement a compliance agreement results in a complaint investigation and, if confirmed, a finding of noncompliance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

The priority areas address all noncompliance. Noncompliance data are presented in Tables 15a and 15c.

Table 15a

Noncompliance related to monitoring priorities, 2004-05

Year	Number of noncompliance findings	Number of corrective actions due in 2004-05	Number of corrective actions completed within one year of identification	Percent of corrective actions completed within one year of identification
2003-04	4,142	4,799	4,473	93.21%
2004-05*	10,726	0	N/A	N/A

*2004-05 figure increased from 2003-04 due to the redevelopment of SESRs

Table 15c

Noncompliance identified through other mechanisms, 2004-05

Year	Number of Agencies	Number of corrective actions due in 2004-05	Number of corrective actions completed within one year of identification	Percent of corrective actions completed within one year of identification
2004-05	200	1,769	1,563	88.35%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Noncompliance Related to Monitoring Findings: It is important to note that monitoring reviews are conducted in April, May, and June of the program year. As a result, review findings do not always generate corrective actions that are due in the same fiscal year. For this reason, there are data from two fiscal years in the baseline data. The 2003-04 data are provided to address the corrective actions that were due in the 2004-05 year.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

The 2004-05 data are provided to address the findings that were made in that year. It is also important to note that there may be more than one corrective action for each finding of noncompliance. Typically, a single finding of systemic noncompliance includes four corrective actions: provision of compliant policies and procedures, evidence of dissemination of policies and procedures, evidence of training on policies and procedures, and a list of students with parent contact information for CDE staff to use in following up and verifying correction. Each corrective action is tracked separately. Table 15a, includes a total of 14,868 findings of noncompliance: 4,142 from 2003-04 and 10,726 from 2004-05. This jump in the number of findings is due to the fact that SESRs were reinstated in 2004-05, following a year of redevelopment. As a result, findings of noncompliance are included from an additional 233 LEAs. Of the findings made in 2003-04, there were 4,799 corrective actions due in 2004-05. Of those, 4,473 (93.21 percent) were corrected on time or within one year of identification. None of the findings made in 04-05 have yet reached a date one year from identification.

Of the corrective actions not completed within one year of identification, all have been closed except for those from two districts: Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (296 corrective actions) and Reef-Sunset Unified School District (8 corrective actions).

CDE has issued special conditions for both districts to receive federal funds. Both districts must submit evidence of corrective actions for all outstanding noncompliance by December 31, 2005. Failure to do so will result in a hearing and withholding of federal funds.

Noncompliance Identified Through Other Mechanisms: Table 14c, indicates that there were 200 LEAs who had findings of noncompliance identified through the complaint investigation process. It should be noted that a single complaint may result in more than one corrective action. There were 1,769 corrective actions due in 2004-05. Of those, 1,563 (88.35 percent) were corrected within one year of identification. Since July 1, 2005, corrective actions have been completed. As of November 1, 2005, there are still 65 corrective actions from 25 agencies being aggressively monitored. Of the 25 agencies, thirteen have received notice of sanction letters.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	100 percent of noncompliance will be corrected within one year of identification
2006 (2006-07)	100 percent of noncompliance will be corrected within one year of identification
2007 (2007-08)	100 percent of noncompliance will be corrected within one year of identification
2008 (2008-09)	100 percent of noncompliance will be corrected within one year of identification
2009 (2009-10)	100 percent of noncompliance will be corrected within one year of identification

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010 (2010-11)	100 percent of noncompliance will be corrected within one year of identification

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Despite the advances that CDE has made in the last years related to automating its monitoring review systems, tracking correction has continued to be based at the individual staff person's desk. That is, as evidence of correction is provided, staff assigned to those districts review the evidence and makes notations of what has been corrected. Staff then record aggregate information on a centralized database, recounting what is corrected in each reporting period. The database has been volatile and unreliable and staff has been required to reenter counts on more than one occasion. CDE is doing two things to improve staff's ability to anticipate what should be corrected and to record corrections only once. First, the ability to track correction of individual findings and corrective actions is being added to the software for both VRs and SESRs. This functionality will allow the staff person the ability to enter correction once into a database directly linked to the individual findings and corrective actions. Staff will also be able to generate a variety of reports of what has been corrected and when, as well as what is slated for correction in the upcoming weeks and months. Second, the SED has completed the first steps in securing approval for integrating the various databases in the division. This action will enable staff in different units to draw information from each other for planning and following-up on district technical assistance and correction. Further, activity to complete the integrated database is dependent on approval from outside control agencies such as the Department of Finance (DOF).

Several activities are also planned to improve the rates of correction. First, additional staff training and oversight will emphasize the importance of the timeline of correction. Second, correspondence with districts related to monitoring and review will highlight the importance of the timelines along with information about potential sanctions that will be implemented for failure to correct in a timely way. The California State Board of Education just adopted (in 2004-05) new regulations clarifying the procedures to be used by the state Superintendent of Public Instruction to withhold funds from LEAs for failure to comply with monitoring and other findings of noncompliance.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Add a corrective action Correction Module to VR and SESR software to track completed or overdue corrective actions on a daily basis	June 30, 2006	CDE Staff
Provide staff training for corrective actions, timelines, and sanctions. Incorporate notice of potential sanctions in monitoring correspondence	January 2, 2006	CDE Staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	Outside contractor subject to approval by DOF
Explore Web-based applications for all components of the monitoring system	June 30, 2006	CDE Staff
Conduct analysis and prepare plans for Annual Performance Reports (APR)	July 1, 2007-June 30, 2011	CDE Staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #16 - Complaints

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B
Indicator - Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
Measurement: See Attachment 1 for additional data. Percent = (Row 1.1(b)) + (Row 1.1(c)) divided by (Row 1.1) times 100

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

To guarantee that the needs of special education students are met, the California Department of Education (CDE) responds to complaints as quickly as possible. CDE encourages resolution at the local level and throughout the compliance complaint 60-day timeline. The state-level investigation and final report is completed within 60 days of the receipt of the written complaint, unless an extension is granted due to exceptional circumstances. The complaint investigation final report contains findings of fact, conclusions and reasons for the conclusions, a timeline for resolving the problem including corrective actions as necessary.

Ensuring state and federal laws and regulations are implemented, CDE utilizes a comprehensive interactive data system to collect, monitor, and analyze alleged violations and correction. In addition to the investigators and manager regularly monitoring individual completion of complaint investigations, a designated staff person monitors the timeliness of each complaint investigation. Regularly produced reports document completion of complaint investigations within the 60-day timeline and data are also utilized for focused monitoring and technical assistance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

Table 16a
Complaints Data for California, 2004-05

(1) Signed, written complaints total	1,248
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	958
(a) Reports with findings	638
(b) Reports within timeline	475
(c) Reports within extended timelines	24
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	260
(1.3) Complaints pending	30
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

These baseline data are also provided in section A of Attachment 1.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Early in 2004-05, staff vacancies and increased numbers of complaints resulted in very large complaint investigation caseloads. Completion of reports within timelines dropped dramatically. SEDE immediately took steps to address these problems:

- 1) Complaint investigation reporting was made the highest priority,
- 2) All SED staff were trained to investigate complaints and write complaint reports,
- 3) All units were assigned to complete investigations,
- 4) Division staff and resources were assigned to complete investigations,
- 5) SED replaced positions and hired short-term investigators,
- 6) SED reviewed and revised complaint investigation and reporting process,
- 7) SED facilitated increased local resolution and alternate dispute resolution (ADR) efforts,
- 8) SED hired outside consultants to evaluate and assess CDE's current practices,
- 9) SED sought information and technical assistance from other large states, and
- 10) SED managers continue to review complaint caseloads and timelines at weekly meetings.

As noted above, the most recent monthly reports indicated that 100 percent of complaints were investigated and reported on time.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	100 percent of written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2006 (2006-07)	100 percent of written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2007 (2007-08)	100 percent of written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2008 (2008-09)	100 percent of written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2009 (2009-10)	100 percent of written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2010 (2010-11)	100 percent of written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continue refinement of final official reports that are timely, clear, and defensible.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Conduct outside evaluation of the Division's complaint intake, investigation, and correction monitoring and utilize recommendations as appropriate.	October 31, 2005	Outside contractor
Continue to provide ongoing training for investigators	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Continue cross-unit activities of team complaint investigations and other monitoring activities to focus on inter-rater reliability and consistency.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Continue and develop ongoing collaboration with CDE legal and other entities such as Parent Training Information Centers, Family Empowerment Centers, local educational agencies, and advocates	June 30, 2006	CDE legal staff, Art Cernosia
Cross branch collaboration with Legal Department and Division	December 30, 2005	CDE staff
Statewide training on IDEA 04	April 2006	Outside Consultant
Align federal and state codes and regulations	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Train CDE staff on new laws and regulations	January 2006	CDE staff
Provide technical assistance on new laws to LEAs	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Collaborate with parent organizations and groups regarding the new federal and state laws and regulations	June 30, 2006	CDE staff
Pursue the development of an integrated database to pro-actively identify upcoming corrective actions across all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	Outside Contractor subject to approval by the Department of Finance

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Explore Web based applications for all components of the monitoring system.	June 30, 2006	CDE staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #17 - Due Process

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B
Indicator - Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))
Measurement: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party is calculated with data from Attachment 1, Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings using the following calculation: Percent = (Row 3.2(a)) + (Row 3.2(b)) divided by (Row 3.2) times 100

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

All procedural safeguards under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 (IDEA) shall be established and maintained by each local plan and educational agency that provides education, related services, or both to children who are individuals with exceptional needs. Parents shall be given a copy of their rights and procedural safeguards upon the first occurrence of the filing for a due process hearing.

All requests for a due process hearing shall be filed with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in accordance with federal regulations. The party, or the attorney representing the party, initiating a due process hearing by filing a written request with the state Superintendent of Public Instruction shall provide the other party to the hearing with a copy of the request at the same time as the request is filed with the state Superintendent of Public Education.

The response to the due process hearing request notice shall be made within ten days of receiving the request notice.

If the party receiving the hearing request notice believes the notice does not sufficiently state the required information, the receiving party must notify the filing party and the hearing officer in writing within 15-days of receiving the hearing request notice. If such a situation, the hearing officer will determine whether the notice sufficiently states the required information and may grant the filing party opportunity to amend the hearing request. Once the hearing request is filed, the timeline will begin again. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall take steps to ensure that within 45- days after receipt of the written hearing request a hearing is conducted in compliance with the federal and state law, culminating in a final administrative decision, including any mediation requested, unless a continuance has been granted by the hearing officer.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Upon receipt by the Superintendent of a written request by the parent or guardian or public education agency, the Superintendent or his or her designee or designees shall immediately notify, in writing, all parties of the request for the hearing and the scheduled date for the hearing. The notice shall advise all parties of all their rights relating to procedural safeguards, as well as a list of persons and organizations within the geographical area that can provide free or reduced cost representation or other assistance in preparing for the due process hearing, including a brief description of qualifications of the services.

The party requesting the due process hearing shall not be allowed to raise issues at the due process hearing that were not raised in the notice filed, unless the other party agrees otherwise.

The state hearing shall be conducted in accordance with regulations adopted by the State Board of Education. The hearing shall be conducted by a person who shall, at a minimum possess knowledge of, and demonstrate the ability to understand, and apply in accordance with standard legal practice and related state statutes and implementing regulations, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1400 et seq.), federal regulations pertaining to the act, and relevant federal and state case law. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall establish standards for the training of hearing officers, the degree of specialization of the hearing officers, and the quality control mechanisms to be used to ensure that the hearings are fair and the decisions are accurate.

A due process hearing officer may not be an employee of the California Department of Education (CDE) or a local educational agency (LEA) nor in a position that would compromise the hearing officer's objectivity in the hearing. The hearing officer shall encourage the parties to a hearing to consider the option of mediation as an alternative to a hearing.

Any party to the hearing held shall be afforded rights consistent with state and federal statutes and regulations, including:

- The right to counsel with special knowledge relating to individuals with exceptional needs; the right to disclosure of all documents to be used at the hearing.
- The right to present evidence, written arguments, and oral arguments;
- The right to confront, cross-examine, and compel the attendance of witnesses; the right to electronic records of the proceedings and confidentiality.

The decision of a due process hearing officer shall be made on the substantive issue of whether the child received a free appropriate public education.

If the hearing matter alleged is a procedural violation, a due process hearing officer may find that a child did not receive a free appropriate public education only if the procedural violation:

- Impeded the child's right to a free appropriate public education;

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

- Significantly impeded the parents' opportunity to participate in the decision making process regarding the provision of a free appropriate public education to the parents' child; or
- Caused a deprivation of educational benefits.

The hearing officer shall produce a written decision of the outcome of the hearing including reasoning relating law and facts to each finding culminating in the final decision. Both the hearing and issuance of the final written decision shall be completed within 45-days of the receipt of the hearing request by the Superintendent, unless an extension has been granted for good cause.

The hearing conducted pursuant to this section of the California *Education Code* (EC) shall be the final administrative determination and binding on all parties.

The aggrieved party may appeal the final decision in state or federal court. A party may file a request within the three-year statute of limitations provision in California EC until October 9, 2006, at which time the statute of limitations becomes two years. The statute of limitations does not apply if:

- 1.) Specific misrepresentations by the local educational agency that it had solved the problem forming the basis of the due process hearing request.
- 2.) The local educational agency's withholding of information from the parent that was required to be provided to the parent.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

One hundred percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Percent is calculated with data from Attachment 1, Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings using the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Percent} &= (\text{Row 3.2(a)}) + (\text{Row 3.2(b)}) \text{ divided by } (\text{Row 3.2}) \text{ times } 100 \\ &= [(5+81)/86] \text{ times } 100 \\ &= 100\end{aligned}$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

These baseline data do not require an explanation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	One hundred percent of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-07)	One hundred percent of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2007 (2007-08)	One hundred percent of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2008 (2008-09)	One hundred percent of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2009 (2009-10)	One hundred percent of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2010 (2010-11)	One hundred percent of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Hearing officers will receive training regarding IDEA, <i>Education Code</i> Section 56000 et. seq., and related regulations. Trainings will be designed to ensure that all hearing officers meet the minimum training standards specified by law.	Ongoing basis	CDE staff, Outside contractors
Hearing officers will receive global skills training.	Annually	Outside contractors
It will be determined when hearing officers have a working knowledge of the laws and regulations governing services to students who qualify for services under IDEA and related California laws and regulations, and the programmatic aspects of special education, services, and supports.	Ongoing basis	Office of Administrative Hearing (OAH) staff
Only hearing officers who have the level of expertise specified in the proposed regulations will be assigned mediation and hearing duties. Such monitoring activities will be provided on an ongoing basis by knowledgeable senior staff.	Ongoing basis	OAH senior staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Data will be gathered pertaining to due process hearings to ensure that all due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. Such data will include the following items: 1) number of hearing requests total; 2) number of resolution sessions conducted; 3) number of settlement agreements; 4) number of hearings held (fully adjudicated); 5) Number of decisions within timeline; 6) number of decisions within extended timeline; 7) number of decisions issued after timelines and extension expired; 8) number of hearings pending; 9) number of expedited hearings; and 10) number of hearing request cases resolved without a hearing. Regarding expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision), the following data will be collected: 1) number of expedited hearing requests total; 2) number of resolution sessions; number of settlement agreements; number of expedited hearings (fully adjudicated); and number of change of placement ordered.</p>	Ongoing	OAH staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #18 - Hearing Requests

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B
Indicator - Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))
Measurement: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. See Attachment 1 Percent is calculated with data from Attachment 1, Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings. Data from Row 3.1(a) is divided by Row (3.1) and the total is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Prior to a party invoking his or her right to an impartial due process hearing, the local educational agency shall convene a resolution session, which is a meeting between the parents and the relevant member or members of the individualized education program team who have specific knowledge of the facts identified in the due process hearing request, in accordance with federal law [*Education Code* (EC) Section 56501.5(a)]

The meeting shall be convened within 15 days of receiving notice of the parents' due process hearing request (EC 56501.5(a)(1)). The meeting shall include a representative of the local educational agency who has decision-making authority on behalf of the agency (EC 56501.5(a)(2)). The meeting shall not include an attorney of the local educational agency, unless the parent is accompanied by an attorney (EC 56501.5(a)(3)). At the meeting, the parents of the child may discuss their due process hearing issue and the facts that form the basis of the due process hearing request, and the local educational agency shall be provided the opportunity to resolve the matter (EC 56501.5(a)(4)).

The resolution session described above is not required if the parents and the local educational agency agree in writing to waive the meeting, or agree to use mediation (EC 56501.5(b)). If the local educational agency has not resolved the due process hearing issue to the satisfaction of the parents within 30 days of the receipt of the due process hearing request notice, the due process hearing may occur, and all of the applicable timelines for a due process hearing shall commence (EC 56501.5(c)).

In the case that a resolution is reached to resolve the due process hearing issue at a meeting described above, the parties shall execute a legally binding agreement that is both of the following: (1) signed by both the parent and a representative of the local educational agency who has the authority to bind the agency; and (2) enforceable in

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a federal district court of the United States. If the parties execute an agreement, a party may void the agreement within three business days of the agreement's execution (EC 56501.5(d)(1)-(2)).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

Prior to the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the California Department of Education (CDE) was not required to gather data specific to resolution sessions. The CDE will get these data in subsequent years from a contractor.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

These baseline data do not require an explanation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided at this time for this indicator. Data will be provided in the Annual Performance Report (SPR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2006 (2006-07)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided at this time for this indicator. Data will be provided in the Annual Performance Report (SPR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2007 (2007-08)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided at this time for this indicator. Data will be provided in the Annual Performance Report (SPR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2008 (2008-09)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided at this time for this indicator. Data will be provided in the Annual Performance Report (SPR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2009 (2009-10)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided at this time for this indicator. Data will be provided in the Annual Performance Report (SPR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.
2010 (2010-11)	As a new SPP indicator, baseline data and targets do not need to be provided at this time for this indicator. Data will be provided in the Annual Performance Report (SPR) that is due no later than February 1, 2007.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Data will be collected pertaining to (1) the number of resolution sessions held; (2) whether the sessions were conducted within the 15-day timeline; (3) the results of the resolution sessions within the 30-day timeline.	Ongoing	Special Education Division staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
The form for requesting a due process hearing will be amended to track the following items: (1) whether a resolution session was held before a request for due processing hearing was completed; (2) whether the session was conducted within the 15-day timeline; (3) confirmation that the complaint was not resolved to the satisfaction of the parents within the 30-day timeline; (4) whether the parents and local educational agency agreed in writing to waive the resolution session.	January 2006	Office of Administrative Hearing staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #19- Mediation

An overview of the SPP development is described on pages 1 and 2 of this document.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B
Indicator - Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)).
Measurement: Percent of mediations that resulted in mediation agreements. Percent is calculated with data from Attachment 1, Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings using the following calculation: Percent = (Row 2.1(a)(i)) + (Row 2.1(b)(i))) divided by (Row 2) times 100

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

It is the intent of the California Legislature that parties to special education disputes be encouraged to seek resolution through mediation prior to filing a request for a due process hearing. It is also the intent of the Legislature that these voluntary prehearing request mediation conferences be an informal process conducted in a nonadversarial atmosphere to resolve issues relating to the identification, assessment, or educational placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child, to the satisfaction of both parties. Therefore, attorneys or other independent contractors used to provide legal advocacy services may not attend or otherwise participate in the prehearing request mediation conferences [*Education Code* (EC) Section 56500.3(a)]. This does not preclude the parent or the public education agency from being accompanied and advised by non-attorney representatives in the mediation conferences and consulting with an attorney prior to or following a mediation conference (EC Section 56500.3(b)).

Requesting or participating in a mediation conference is not a prerequisite to requesting a due process hearing (EC Section 56500.3(c)). All requests for a mediation conference shall be filed with the Superintendent. The party initiating a mediation conference by filing a written request with the Superintendent shall provide the other party to the mediation with a copy of the request at the same time the request is filed with the Superintendent. The mediation conference shall be conducted by a person knowledgeable in the process of reconciling differences in a nonadversarial manner and under contract with the department. The mediator shall be knowledgeable in the laws and regulations governing special education (EC Section 56500.3(d)).

The prehearing mediation conference shall be scheduled within 15 days of receipt by the Superintendent of the request for mediation. The mediation conference shall be completed within 30 days after receipt of the request for mediation unless both parties to the prehearing mediation conference agree to extend the time for completing the mediation. Pursuant to federal law, and to encourage the use of mediation, the state

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

shall bear the cost of the mediation process, including any meetings described in subsection (d) of Section 300.506 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The costs of mediation shall be included in the contract described in EC Section 56504.5 (EC Section 56500.3(e)).

In accordance with federal law, if a resolution is reached that resolves the due process issue through the mediation process, the parties shall execute a legally binding written agreement that sets forth the resolution and that does the following: (1) states that all discussions that occurred during the mediation process shall be confidential and may not be used as evidence in any subsequent due process hearing or civil proceeding; (2) is signed by both the parent and the representative of the public education agency who has the authority to bind the agency; (3) is enforceable in any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a federal district court of the United States (EC Section 56500.3(f)(1)-(3)).

If the mediation conference fails to resolve the issues to the satisfaction of all parties, the party who requested the mediation conference has the option of filing for a state-level hearing. The mediator may assist the parties in specifying any unresolved issues to be included in the hearing request (EC Section 56500.3(g)).

Any mediation conference held pursuant to this section shall be scheduled in a timely manner and shall be held at a time and place reasonably convenient to the parties to the dispute in accordance with federal law.

The mediation conference shall be conducted in accordance with regulations adopted by the board (EC Section 56500.3(i)). Notwithstanding any procedure set forth in this code, a public education agency and a parent may, if the party initiating the mediation conference so chooses, meet informally to resolve any issue or issues to the satisfaction of both parties prior to the mediation conference (EC Section 56500.3(j)). The procedures and rights contained in this section shall be included in the notice of parent rights attached to the pupil's assessment plan (EC Section 56500.3(k)).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

Fifty four and six-tenths percent of mediations resulted in mediation agreements. Percent is calculated with data from Attachment 1, Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings using the following calculation:

Discussion of Baseline Data:

These baseline data do not require an explanation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	At least fifty-six percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-07)	At least fifty-seven percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.
2007 (2007-08)	At least fifty-eight percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.
2008 (2008-09)	At least fifty-nine percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.
2009 (2009-10)	At least sixty percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.
2010 (2010-11)	At least sixty-one percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
With stakeholder input and in coordination with CDE, mediators will receive 80 hours of specialized training annually in special education law and issues, mediation techniques, prehearing processes, and current pedagogical issues.	Annually	CDE staff, Outside contractors
Annual training will address consistency in procedures and practices.	Annually	Outside contractors
Mediators will receive training that addresses the global competencies for all adjudicative proceedings. This global skills training will address such topics as the dynamics of mediation, listening and communication skills, interest-based mediation, techniques to avoid impasse, and writing clear and complete mediation agreements.	Annually	Outside contractors
Data pertaining to mediations will be collected, including such data as the 1) number of mediation requests total; 2) number of mediations not related to hearing requests; 3) number of mediations related to hearing requests; 4) number of mediation agreements not related to hearing requests; 5) number of mediation agreements related to hearing requests; and 6) number of mediations pending.	Ongoing	Office of Administrative Hearing staff

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Indicator #20 - State-reported Data

An overview of the State Performance Plan (SPP) development is described on pages 1 and 2.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision
Indicator - State-reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Plan Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)).
Measurement: 20A. State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy). 20B. The percentage of special education local plan areas (SELPA) submitting accurate data in a timely manner.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Accurate and timely data are ensured through a variety of mechanisms including bi-annual statewide California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) meetings, data verification routines built into statewide software provided by the California Department of Education (CDE), and technical assistance. Accurate 618 data are also ensured through the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data validation process. During 2004-05, CDE hosted four technical assistance meetings throughout the state, focusing on accurate and timely data reporting. The California data collection procedures require local educational agencies (LEA) to submit data to the State by prescribed deadlines. These deadlines are delineated in the CASEMIS Users Manual provided to LEAs through the CDE Web site well in advance. In addition, LEAs must certify that student-level data meet state and federal criteria for accuracy prior to submitting to the CDE. The criteria are listed in Chapter V of the CASEMIS Users Manual.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-05):

During the 2004-05 school year, all federal reports were submitted to OSEP on or before the deadline.

One hundred percent of SELPAs submitted accurate data to CDE in a timely manner in 2004-05. In 2003-04 this figure was 99 percent. In 2002-03 this figure was 98 percent. The number of SELPAs submitting timely and accurate data has been a key element of the CASEMIS data submission process.

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data for the baseline measure capturing the percentage of SELPAs submitting accurate data in a timely manner was also reported in the last two Annual Performance Report (APR) reporting cycles (FFY 03 and FFY 04).

Data for the baseline measure capturing the percent of federal reports submitted by CDE to OSEP on time is a new measure for this indicator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-06)	20A. One hundred percent of state-reported data, including 618 data, the State Performance Plan (SPP), and Annual Performance Reports (APR) are submitted on time and are accurate. 20B. One hundred percent of the SELPAs will submit accurate data to CDE in a timely manner.
2006 (2006-07)	20A. One hundred percent of state-reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Reports (APR) are submitted on time and are accurate. 20B. One hundred percent of the SELPAs will submit accurate data to CDE in a timely manner.
2007 (2007-08)	20A. One hundred percent of state-reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Reports (APR) are submitted on time and are accurate. 20B. One hundred percent of the SELPAs will submit accurate data to CDE in a timely manner.
2008 (2008-09)	20A. One hundred percent of state-reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Reports (APR) are submitted on time and are accurate. 20B. One hundred percent of the SELPAs will submit accurate data to CDE in a timely manner.
2009 (2009-10)	20A. One hundred percent of state-reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Reports (APR) are submitted on time and are accurate. 20B. One hundred percent of the SELPAs will submit accurate data to CDE in a timely manner.
2010 (2010-11)	20A. One hundred percent of state-reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Reports (APR) are submitted on time and are accurate.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Future activities include continuing with at least bi-annual training sessions (October 2006) with SELPAs and LEAs, improving data collection software, and providing technical assistance. In addition, the Special Education Division will continue to participate in statewide discussions to create a statewide student-level data system for all students in California.

The new data requirements of the SPP require extensive modification to existing data management systems at the state and local levels. During the 2005-06 school year CDE staff will work to modify the CASEMIS software. CDE staff will provide extensive

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10

training, software support, and ongoing technical assistance to SELPAs and LEAs during the transition to the new CASEMIS collection. The combination of beta testing, built-in validation, and extensive training will ensure that accurate and reliable data are submitted.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs	October 21, 2005 October 28, 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Finalize new data fields for CASEMIS	Fall 2005	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs
Modify CASEMIS data table structure to incorporate new data fields and update table codes.	Fall 2005	CDE staff
Modify validation codes and develop prototype reports.	Spring 2006	CDE staff
Beta-test new CASEMIS software	Summer 2006	CDE staff
Deploy official of CASEMIS software.	October 2006	CDE staff
Provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure reliable and accurate submission of data.	Ongoing throughout the year	CDE staff
Provide statewide CASEMIS training for SELPAs	Each year in the Fall and as necessary	CDE staff, SELPA, LEAs

State of California Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-10**Attachment 1: Report of dispute resolution under Part B of
the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

Section A: Signed, Written Complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	1,248
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	958
(a) Reports with findings	638
(b) Reports within timeline	475
(c) Reports within extended timelines	24
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	260
(1.3) Complaints pending	30
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0
Section B: Mediation Requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	3,730
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	2,146
(i) Mediation agreements	1,819
(b) Mediations not related to due process	272
(i) Mediation agreements	219
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	185
Section C: Hearing Requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	3,306
(3.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	86
(a) Decisions within timeline	5
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	81
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	1,938
Section D: Expedited Hearing Requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	143
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	5
(a) Change of placement ordered	1